

THE  
CAMBRIDGE  
ANCIENT HISTORY

EDITED BY

J. B. BURY, M.A., F.B.A.

S. A. COOK, LITT.D.

F. E. ADCOCK, M.A.

4448

VOLUME I

EGYPT AND BABYLONIA

TO 1580 B.C.

SECOND EDITION

*CAMBRIDGE*

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1928

# CONTENTS

xxi

	PAGE
II. DATA FOR HISTORY . . . . .	247
Introduction of the Calendar . . . . .	248
Sources for the predynastic period . . . . .	250
Historical slate palettes . . . . .	251
Ivory knife-handle from Gebel el-Arak . . . . .	252
Original home of the predynastic Egyptian . . . . .	254
Indications of eastern origin . . . . .	255

## CHAPTER VII

### THE UNION OF EGYPT AND THE OLD KINGDOM

By H. R. HALL

I. THE LISTS OF KINGS: DYNASTY I . . . . .	257
Sources . . . . .	258
Infiltration of aliens . . . . .	261
Hamites and Armenoids . . . . .	262
Kingdoms of the north and south . . . . .	265
Pre-Menic kings . . . . .	266
The originals of Menes . . . . .	267
Narmerza . . . . .	268
The court of Semti . . . . .	270
The dead and mummification . . . . .	272
II. DYNASTIES II-IV . . . . .	274
Zoser and the first pyramid . . . . .	276
The age of Snefru . . . . .	278
Pyramids of Gizeh . . . . .	281
Zenith of Egyptian art . . . . .	282
Mycerinus . . . . .	282
III. THE CLOSE OF THE OLD KINGDOM . . . . .	284
The 'son of the Sun-god' . . . . .	285
Art and religion . . . . .	286
The 'admonitions of Ptahhotep' . . . . .	288
Unis and the pyramid at Sakkarah . . . . .	290
Pepi . . . . .	291
Uni in Palestine . . . . .	293
Entrance of negroes . . . . .	295
The Heracleopolites . . . . .	297

## CHAPTER VIII

### THE MIDDLE KINGDOM AND THE HYKSOS CONQUEST

By H. R. HALL

DYNASTIES XI AND XII . . . . .	299
Amenemhet I and the god Amon . . . . .	301
The Instructions of Amenemhet . . . . .	303
The story of Sinuhe . . . . .	304
The works of Senusret (Sesostris) I . . . . .	305
Relations with Crete . . . . .	307
Senusret III, the historical Sesostris . . . . .	308
Amenemhet III . . . . .	309

	PAGE
II. THE HYKSOS . . . . .	310
North Syrian movements . . . . .	312
Yekeb-hal, Khian and other kings . . . . .	313
Expulsion of the Hyksos . . . . .	314
III. THE INTERNAL CONDITIONS OF THE AGE . . . . .	315
Life of the people . . . . .	317
Officials and soldiers . . . . .	318
Tombs and religion . . . . .	321
The priesthood . . . . .	323
Religious literature . . . . .	324
A Messianic prophecy . . . . .	325

## CHAPTER IX

LIFE AND THOUGHT IN EGYPT UNDER THE OLD  
AND MIDDLE KINGDOMS

BY T. E. PEET

General Egyptian character . . . . .	326
I. THE ARCHAIC PERIOD AND THE OLD KINGDOM . . . . .	328
Local and solar cults . . . . .	329
Osiris . . . . .	332
The <i>ka</i> . . . . .	334
The tomb, death and the hereafter . . . . .	336
II. THE EARLIER INTERMEDIATE PERIOD, VII <sup>TH</sup> TO X <sup>TH</sup> DYNASTIES . . . . .	340
Language and writing . . . . .	341
Early literature . . . . .	343
Pessimism . . . . .	345
III. THE MIDDLE KINGDOM . . . . .	346
Moral standards . . . . .	347
‘Story of the Eloquent Peasant’ . . . . .	349
Coffin Texts . . . . .	351
Belief in a judgment . . . . .	353
<i>Hike</i> , magic and morality . . . . .	354

## CHAPTER X

## EARLY BABYLONIA AND ITS CITIES

BY STEPHEN H. LANGDON, M.A., B.D., PH.D.  
Professor of and Shillito Reader in Assyriology, Oxford

I. PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS . . . . .	356
The Euphrates and Lower Mesopotamia . . . . .	358
Sumer and the date-palm . . . . .	360
II. THE ORIGIN OF THE SUMERIANS . . . . .	361
The cultures of Anau and Susa . . . . .	362
III. EARLIEST TRADITIONAL DYNASTIES . . . . .	364
The first city-states . . . . .	365
The third dynasty of Kish . . . . .	368
The fourth dynasty of Kish . . . . .	370
Sumerian writing and religion . . . . .	371

## CHAPTER VIII

### THE MIDDLE KINGDOM AND THE HYKSOS CONQUEST

#### I. DYNASTIES XI AND XII

WE do not know which of the Theban princes was the conqueror of Siut and Heracleopolis, but it was one of the two or three between Intef-o, or Iniotef-o, the first who assumed royal dignity, and Mentuhotep Nebhapatre, who ruled over the whole kingdom from north to south. A certain Meri ruled Epet (Thebes) in the time of the VIth Dynasty; but after his time it fell under the rule of the princely house of the neighbouring town of Hermonthis. We have a record of a chief of Hermonthis in the Heracleopolite period named Intef or Iniotef (Antef); but the earliest Theban of the Hermonthite house whom we know was a certain Iniotefi (Intefi), son of Ikui, probably a near descendant of the Hermonthite Intef, who ruled the whole south under the Heracleopolite king, and 'made his two lands to live.' Then came Intef 'the great,' Intef-o (Antef-aa), who made himself king and founded the XIth Dynasty (c. 2375-2212 B.C.?). He adopted the royal style of 'Horus Uah-ankh ("increasing life"), Son of the Sun Intef-o.' He also called himself *Insibya*, 'King of Upper and Lower Egypt' (a title to which he had no right *de facto*), but assumed no throne-name. In this he was copied by his two successors, and the preference of all three for the Horus-title may perhaps be due to a wish to insist upon their legitimate position as Upper Egyptian kings, ruling by the right of Horus. Intef Uah-ankh pushed his frontier beyond his own original domains as far north as the district of Akhmim (Panopolis), and made the Thinite nome (Abydos) his 'Door of the North,' thus imitating the old official description of Aswān as 'the Door of the South.' The stele recording this is dated in his fiftieth year, which need not be taken to mean literally his fiftieth year as king, but to include his years as prince of Thebes before his assumption of royal dignity. Though a long-lived man, he need not have been a long-lived king; and as his proclamation of himself as king must at once have brought down upon him the enmity of Heracleopolis



and its powerful vassal, Siut, a reign of fifty years would imply fifty years of fighting, which seems improbable.

To him succeeded Intef II, Horus Nakhtnebtetnefer, and to him Mentuhotep I, Horus Sankhibtoui, who may possibly be identical with the Mentuhotep who assumed the throne-name Nebtouire ('Lord of the Two Lands of Re'). If so, he may have been the conqueror of Siut and Heracleopolis, and adopted the throne-name to mark his overthrow of the last Heracleopolite, Merikere or an unknown successor. This is however only a surmise, and Nebtouire may be the successor of Sankhibtoui. His successors bore a throne-name in the usual way, and their Horus-name resumes its usual place in the titulary, the first of them being apparently Nebhapetre Mentuhotep II (or III). This king seems at one time to have spelt his throne-name differently (as 'Nebkhrure'), and to have borne two Horus-names, Neterhezet and Samtoui. These mean 'Divine is the White Crown (of Upper Egypt)' and 'Uniting the Two Lands,' and he appears to have adopted the latter in the middle of his reign, in order to commemorate the overthrow of Memphis and the reunion of all Egypt under one sceptre, which cannot have taken place after his time, while he himself was undoubtedly king of all Egypt. This change has a much older precedent in the case of Khasekhemui after he had reunited the two lands (p. 276), and precedents were followed by the Egyptians. It has been usually assumed that the names point to two kings; but both the Turin Papyrus and Manetho agree that there were only six kings in the dynasty, and, if this is so, we must 'telescope' into one, either Sankhibtoui and Nebtouire, or Neterhezet and Samtoui.

Nebhapetre's reign was long (c. 2290-2242 B.C.?), and he is the dominant figure of the dynasty. We have monuments of him from various parts of Egypt, notably from Dendera, where he rebuilt or added to the Temple of Hathor, and from Der el-Bahri, in the western necropolis of Thebes, where he excavated his tomb and built in front of it a remarkable funerary temple, excavated by the Egypt Exploration Fund in the years 1903-7, under the direction of Professor Naville and the present writer. In this tomb we see that the temple has gradually so grown and the pyramid so diminished that the pyramid has become a mere meaningless erection in the middle of the temple, the actual tomb being at the back of the whole building, deeply excavated in the rock. The coloured reliefs, fragmentary though they are, from the walls of the building have given us a new idea of the art of the time, which has since been confirmed from Dendera. Under the older kings

of the XI<sup>th</sup> Dynasty the sculptor's art, neglected in days of ruin and civil war, appears extraordinarily barbarous in style. Beautifully delicate reliefs had been produced under the VI<sup>th</sup> Dynasty, but in two or three centuries the whole tradition of the art of the Memphites had been lost in the south, and the work of the times of Uah-ankh and his successors is amazingly crude. It is still crude under Nebhapatre, but improving enormously. The name of this king's chief sculptor, Mertisen, is known; and in his funerary inscription he speaks as one excessively proud of his art, and as if it were altogether unusual to be good at it.

After a reign that certainly exceeded forty-six years, Nebhapatre was succeeded by another Mentuhotep with the throne-name Sankhkere, of whom nothing much is known beyond the fact that he sent an expedition by sea to Puenet, though he reigned about thirty years (*c.* 2242–2212 B.C.?). With him the XI<sup>th</sup> Dynasty ended, after a duration of about 160 years, and, after some palace intrigue of which we do not know the details, the XII<sup>th</sup> Dynasty began with Sehetepibre Amenemhet I (*c.* 2212 B.C.?).

Amenemhet I shows by his name that he was more especially devoted to Amon, the god of Epet. The Mentuhotep names of the XI<sup>th</sup> Dynasty had shown fidelity to the original home of the family at Hermonthis (Erment), the seat of the god Mentu or Munt. We know that the family relationship of Amenemhet to the Mentuhoteps was close, though there is a break marked by the change of dynasty. He may have been descended from the Iniotefs in a younger line, and was possibly the vizier of Sankhkere. The Mentuhoteps did not particularly venerate Amon, whence it is possible that Amenemhet's immediate progenitors had specially devoted themselves to Thebes. Amon, its human-headed god, was probably a local form of the ancient and well-known god Min of Coptos. His temple was that of Karnak, called *Nesut-toui*, 'the Thrones of the Two Lands,' and it is probable that this was already very ancient. The temple in southern Epet (Luxor) was a later foundation.

Amenemhet made this god the official chief deity of Egypt; and he was soon identified with Re, and as Amon-Re, but bearing the outer semblance of Amon only, he was made king of all the gods. A new king of the gods appeared with the new king of men. It cannot be said yet, however, that the centre of gravity of the nation has shifted to the south, to the city of Amon. For a time the later kings of the XI<sup>th</sup> Dynasty had apparently made Thebes their capital, but those of the XII<sup>th</sup>, Thebans though they were, found that the capital was better placed towards the north. Never-

theless, they did not restore either Heracleopolis or Memphis to this position, but, instead, built for their capital a fortress-city between the two, in the neighbourhood of the modern Lisht, which they called Itht-toui, 'Controller of the Two Lands,' a name which explains its character and function. The kings of the XIIth Dynasty were strangers in the north. We do not know whether Amenemhet I or his predecessor, Nebhapetre, legitimized their position by marriage with the Memphite or the Heracleopolite family or with both. But the fact remained that they were the descendants of the mere nomarch of Hermonthis and Thebes, places entirely undistinguished in previous history, and that (possibly owing to the invasion of the southerly nomes by Nubian and negro barbarians after the close of the VIth Dynasty), they had become the wardens of the south, and had then assumed the Pharaonic dignity and enforced their claim to it by arms. They did not attempt to hide their origin. Thebes was never ashamed of it, and in the (otherwise very inaccurate) Karnak list of kings even the nomarch Iniotefi is commemorated as *erpati*. Moreover, Senusret I set up a statue in honour of 'his father, the *erpati*, Intef-o, born of Ikui.' This is probably the nomarch Intefi, though he is given the peculiar name (Intef-o) of king Uah-anekh.

Comparatively plebeian origin was thus openly confessed, and a show of force seemed necessary to assure the royalty of the new house, at all events in the north, where the kings lived, in order to check instantly any attempt at revolt. Amenemhet I was no doubt the builder of Itht-toui. The energy and determination he showed was maintained by his successors, especially by Senusret III (Sesostris) and Amenemhet III (Lamaris), two of the greatest rulers that not only Egypt, but even the world, has ever seen. 'Character' is the distinguishing mark of these kings, and energy is evident in their contemporary portraits, which seem to show a strain of negro blood, probably derived from fierce Sudanese invaders of the south, three centuries or more before. In them the Pyramid-builders were re-born, Khufu and Khafre had come again.

The 'hereditary prince' (*erpati-hatio*) still rules his nome as in the days of the Pepis; he is still locally almost independent of the king. But the latter no longer impotently tolerates his independence and his waging of private war, but watches him cat-like from his lair at Itht-toui, ready to pounce at any sign of defiance of the royal authority. This was still precarious, and the passage from one reign to another was always dangerous. For this reason Amenemhet I inaugurated the institution of co-regency, characteristic of this dynasty, so that in his old age he might have by his

side a younger and vigorous fellow-king, bound to him by ties of self-interest, even if those of filial duty had no weight, who would succeed him automatically and obviate the danger of an interregnum and revolt of feudatories. This device is characteristic of the politic mind of the founder of the XIIth Dynasty, who bequeathed to his son a set of maxims, renowned in later days as a classic, 'the Instructions of king Sehetepibre,' inculcating a hard wisdom. Above all, his successor is warned to have no friends. 'Fill not thy heart with a brother, know not a friend, make not for thyself intimates wherein there is no end, harden thyself against subordinates, that thou mayest be king of the earth, that thou mayest be ruler of the lands, that thou mayest increase good.' This note of 'increasing good' is characteristic of this king and of his dynasty; and their claim is justified that in their time the good of the people as a whole was considered and furthered. 'I was one who cultivated grain and loved Nepri the harvest-god; the Nile greeted me in every reach; none was hungry in my years, none thirsted then; men dwelt in peace through my deeds and spake concerning me,' says Amenemhet in his 'Instructions.' We meet, in the mind of Amenemhet, for the first time, the conception of single-minded public duty, and the obligation of the king to benefit his subjects, which became the tradition of his descendants. They, following his policy, succeeded in the end in completely breaking the power of the local princes, and re-established a centralized state like that of the IVth Dynasty, though of course with differences of detail, and with a higher purpose.

Amenemhet spent his life<sup>1</sup> in visiting every part of his dominions

<sup>1</sup> A most interesting object of his time, probably, is the lapis seal-cylinder, a bilingual, published by Pinches and Newberry, *Journ. of Eg. Arch.* VII, 1921, pp. 196 *sqq.* It contains the Babylonian name Pikin-ili, or rather Wakin-ili, and that of the Egyptian king, Sehetepibre, probably the first of the three who bore this name, *viz.* Amenemhet I. Certainly the cutting of the Egyptian signs is of XIIth Dynasty character. The character of the cuneiform itself is inconclusive; and it cannot be maintained that, because it resembles that of Sargon of Akkad and Naram-Sin, the date of Amenemhet, and therefore of the XIIth Dynasty, should be carried back to their time. The name of the Babylonian owner is of a period not earlier than that of Hammurabi (*c.* 2100 B.C.), which is broadly that of the XIIth Dynasty. To date the latter (with Petrie) 1460 years before 2000 would take us to 3460 B.C., the days of the earliest Sumerian patesis, before cuneiform really existed, and long before such an inscription as that of Wakin-ili could have been cut; though, of course, it might be argued that Wakin-ili had his name inscribed on the cylinder centuries after it was made. Hence the later date for the XIIth Dynasty—not earlier than 2200 B.C.—still remains the more probable. See also p. 169.

and in warring against the barbarians on every hand. Towards the end of his life the young king Senusret (Sesostris I), his son, naturally took his place in warlike expeditions; and while he was absent on one of these in Libya, the old king died and was buried in a pyramid at Lisht, close to Itht-toui. We know of the circumstances from the Romance of Sanehat or Sinuhe, the story of a young noble who accompanied Senusret. 'In the year 30, second month of the first season, on the 7th day, departed the god into his horizon, the *insibya* Sehetepibre. He ascended to heaven, he joined the sun; the divine limbs were mingled with him that begat him. At the court was silence; the great double doors were closed, the court sat mourning, the people bowed down in silence.' On the arrival of the news of the king's death, Senusret immediately left the army ('the hawk, he flew; together with his following, not letting the army know'), in order to ensure his accession. Sinuhe, however, for reasons which we do not gather, but were probably connected with some intrigue against Senusret, of which he was cognizant or in which he had taken part, fled alone, crossed the Delta, and exiled himself till old age with a Semitic tribe. Eventually he was pardoned and returned to Egypt, to be received in full state by the king, and be buried in a tomb, the royal gift, as befitted an Egyptian noble, and not in a sheepskin like an Arab. All this we learn from the story, a classic of the XIIth Dynasty, known to us from no less than twelve papyri and ostraca (see pp. 226 *sqq.*).

Amenemhet I had reigned thirty years (c. 2212-2182 B.C.?). Of these the last ten were shared with his son. Comparatively full as our knowledge is with regard to the history of the IVth to the VIth Dynasties, our information with regard to the XIIth is far more complete. All the lists agree with each other and with the monuments as to names; and the Turin Papyrus gives 213 years for the length of the dynasty, the monuments apparently 212. Manetho's years are not very correct, but his names (since the necessary emendations of his copyists' errors are easily made) are very accurate. Contemporary records of dates in the years of the various reigns are frequent, and can be checked by each other in several instances owing to the habit of co-regency which was regular during the first half of the reign (see above). The Turin Papyrus allows for these co-regencies. We have now, therefore, passed from the region of guess-work into one of documented history.

Senusret I ('Usret's Man') bore the name of Usret, a goddess not often met with in Egyptian mythology and usually

identified with Isis. It is the original of the 'Sesostris' of the Greeks. But whereas Manetho's copyists have preserved it for Senusret II, in the case of the first of the name some careless transcriber has confused it with the name of the much later king Sheshonk (the biblical Shishak) and gives it as 'Sesonkhosis.' His throne-name was Kheperkere. He reigned 45 years in all (c. 2192-2157 B.C.?), ten in conjunction with his father and three with his son. Seven years before his father's death he officially laid the foundation of a new and splendid temple of the Sun at Heliopolis (On), the sole remaining relic of which is his red granite obelisk still standing amid the palms of Matarieh. Its fellow fell in 1258 A.D. and has disappeared. Another monument of his is the small round-topped obelisk at Ebgig, in the Fayyum. He built extensively at Abydos and Karnak. We have a fine limestone relief of him from Coptos, which shows how entirely the art of Egypt had recovered from the dark age into which it had fallen after the time of the Pepis, and from which it only began to emerge in the days of Nebhaptre. The work of the time of Amenemhet I is already of extraordinary delicacy and beauty. The tomb of the nome-prince Ameni at Beni-Hasan is one of the finest in Egypt, with beautiful painted decoration showing the taste and sense of proportion characteristic of the art of the dynasty (see p. 575). From its inscriptions we learn that the king was an energetic warrior, and carried his arms into Kush, the nome of Ethiopia, which we first find mentioned under the VIth Dynasty, and is now the usual appellation of the Nubian land. Ameni seems to have been a loyal feudatory who followed his king to war with all the forces of his nome. Stelae were set up by Amenemhet I at Korosko to record 'the overthrow of Wawat' (northern Nubia between the First and Second Cataracts), which had presumably revolted at the change of dynasty. And at Wadi Halfa Senusret I commemorated his further conquests. He presumably reoccupied southern Nubia, between the Second and Third Cataracts, which had already belonged to Pepi I.

Hapzefi, prince of Siut, was Senusret's governor at Kerma (the Third Cataract). He is well known from his great tomb at Siut, in which are inscribed his numerous benefactions and chantry-foundations. But he was never buried in this tomb. He died at Kerma, and was interred there under a great mound, in Nubian fashion, surrounded by the bodies of Nubian slaves who were killed in order to accompany him to the next world. The discovery of this gives a new idea of the relations of the Egyptians to their Nubian subjects. We see these ruled, apparently, by tyrannical

Egyptian satraps, who treated them as slaves. From the relics found in the burial of Hapzeft we perceive that a sort of colonial art had begun to arise in Nubia: Egyptian ideas were clumsily copied and modified by the natives. From this time dates the 'Egyptianization' of the Nubians, which in far later days caused Egyptian civilization to survive there in a debased form when it was dead in Egypt itself. Mixed with the native Nubians were the negroes, who had probably overrun the country, and perhaps even penetrated into Egypt itself during the intermediate period between the Old and Middle Kingdoms. The expeditions of the kings of the XIIth Dynasty seem chiefly to have been directed against the negroes who were recognized as formidable foes, and in the time of Senusret III seem to have pushed the Egyptians back from the Third to the Second Cataract.

Senusret I was buried in the southern pyramid of Lisht, in the immediate vicinity of Itht-toui. Ten colossal seated figures of the king in white limestone were found in a court east of the pyramid, and are now in the Cairo Museum. His successor Amenemhet II Nubkaure, reigned 35 years (c. 2150—2115 B.C.), three years in conjunction with his father, and three with his son. Manetho calls him Ammanemes, and says he was slain by his guards. He was the least-distinguished of his dynasty; and several of the great men of his time are better known to us than he, notably Khnum-hotep, son of Neheri (prince of the nome of Mahez, whose tomb at Beni-Hasan is one of the most interesting there), Tahutihetep of el-Bersheh, Sihathor the explorer of the Nubian gold-mines, and Khentekhtai-uer, who sailed to Puenet and returned to Koseir in peace with his ships in the king's twenty-fourth year. The gold of Nubia was now flowing in a steady stream into the royal coffers; and though we may see in this reign a falling-off from the energy of the two preceding, and possibly a revival of activity on the part of the feudatories, the accession of wealth to the court did much to secure the position of the king.

Senusret II, Khakheperre, reigned nineteen years (c. 2118—2099 B.C.), three years with his father and possibly an unknown number of years with his son. Like his predecessor, he does not seem to have been a warrior, and Nubia was probably peaceable during his reign. Egypt was rich and prosperous, and its fertility and abundance were now attracting a considerable immigration of Semites from the desert into the settled land. In the tomb of Neheri's son Khnumhotep at Beni-Hasan, already mentioned, we see depicted the reception of a body of 37 Aamu (bedouins), led by a chief, Abshai, who brought with them tribute of *meszamut*,

or green antimony eye-paint, the modern *kohl*, which was, and still is, much prized by the Egyptians (see p. 228). This was in the sixth year of Senusret II. Relations existed with other foreigners besides the Semites. At Kahun in the ruins of the town of the workmen who built the pyramid of the king at Illahun, near the entrance to the Fayyum, have been found many fragments of the contemporary polychrome pottery of the Minoans of Crete. This ware, known as 'Kamarais' or 'Kamares' ware, from the locality of the cave on the southern slope of Mount Ida, in which a great quantity of it was found, is of the period commonly designated as 'Middle Minoan II,' which was thus contemporary with the XIIth Dynasty (see p. 175).

We know that relations with Crete existed even earlier than this, for the spiral design which suddenly appears on Egyptian scarabs of the time of Senusret I was of Aegean or more northern origin, and the art of glazing pottery was probably imported from Egypt into Crete earlier still. The forms of Cretan stone vases of the older 'Early Minoan' period also appear often to be imitated from those made in Egypt under the VIth Dynasty and earlier. The ships of Snefru that went to Phoenicia were no doubt soon succeeded by others that coasted round the southern shore of Asia Minor, and that the early Cretans were keen seafarers who could well cross the sea to Libya and thence coast to Egypt we know. In the time of Sankhkere, Henu, the Puenet-farer, had defeated an attack of the Haau—a name read later as 'Haunebu' and identified with the Greeks of the Delta. The pyramid-town in which the users of Cretan pottery dwelt was called *Het-hotep-Senusret*, 'the House of the Peace of Senusret.' The excavation of it has given us the best-known example of an ancient Egyptian town, with its complex of streets and houses; and in its ruins have been found a number of hieratic papyri, containing legal and other documents of high interest. The pyramid is of brick, faced with stone, on a core of rock.

Senusret II was succeeded by his son, the great king Senusret III, Khakaure, or 'Lachares' (c. 2099–2061 B.C.?), who best deserves part of the renown attached to the name of Sesostris in later legend. Tales of the wars of the XVIIIth Dynasty kings, of Seti I, and especially of Ramses II, have combined with echoes of the days of its real original, to form the legendary figure of the conqueror Sesostris, who marched even to Bactria and India. The historical Senusret III confined his activity to Nubia and southern Palestine; the inscription of one of his followers, Khusebek, tells of the Nubian wars and of an expedition against a place in



Palestine called Sekmem, in which a doubtful conjecture would find the biblical Shechem (p. 229).

In Nubia Senusret set up at Semneh, the ancient fortress commanding the Second Cataract, above Wadi Halfa, an inscription couched in unprecedented phraseology, reminding us strangely of that of the proclamations said by Diodorus to have been inscribed on stelae by the legendary Sesostriis to commemorate his conquests. This is my frontier here, he says in effect: no negro shall pass north of it. 'I am the king, and what I say I do,' he adds. The successor who abandons this frontier is no son of mine. And I have put up my statue at this my frontier 'not from any desire that ye should worship it, but that ye should fight for it!' Sarcasm is not usually found in an ancient Egyptian inscription. The king seems to have had no very great idea of the valour of his subjects. Evidently the negroes were troublesome in his reign, and it would seem that the king's two predecessors had abandoned the Dongola province, and that for military reasons he was compelled to establish an impassable barrier against the barbarians at the desert of the Second Cataract region, where, in later days, in spite of his prohibition, he was worshipped as the tutelary deity of Nubia.

The energy of this proclamation is reflected in the traits of the king's face, which we know well from several statues of him, notably those discovered in the forecourt of the temple of Nebhaptre, at Der el-Bahri, where the king had placed them as a tribute to his great predecessor. These represent the king at different periods of his life, from youth to old age. Three are in the British Museum, and the oldest shows us a visage of fierce vigour and pride. He reigned 38 years, some of them possibly in co-regency with his father, and seems to have associated his successor with him on the throne, although so masterful a man would be hardly likely to delegate any of his authority for long. Probably he had removed all danger of feudal revolt. His power bore heavily on the great local princes, who no doubt found in him a hard task-master. The Amenis and Khnumhoteps of earlier reigns do not reappear under him. He abolished their power, and his successor was the all-powerful divine lord of all Egypt, as Khufu and Khafre had been.

He was buried in the northern brick pyramid of Dahshūr, north of Lisht. Near him were interred his queen and two of the princesses of his family, whose graves have yielded to the Cairo Museum an inestimable treasure of the jeweller's art of the time, in the shape of beautiful pectoral ornaments, bracelets and scarabs of gold inlaid with carnelian, jasper, lapis and green felspar, neck-

laces of solid gold cowries, beads of gold and amethyst, and pendants in the shape of the claws of lions.

The great Sesostris was succeeded by the greater Amenemhet III Ne-maat-re or 'Lamaris' (c. 2061-2013 B.C.?), one of the most remarkable monarchs of antiquity. He was the counterpart in peace of what Sesostris had been in war. His reign lasted 48 years. He associated with him in his royalty for a time a prince named Hor, with the throne-name Auibre, who seems to have died before him. Thereafter he ruled alone, the 'good god' who benefited Egypt more than any before him, except possibly the unknown early maker of the Bahr Yusef, the artificial stream that duplicates the course of the Nile and widens its cultivation for so many scores of miles in Middle Egypt. He was the regulator, rather than the creator, of Lake Moeris, now represented by the somewhat differently lying Birket el-Karun, in the Fayyum, the 'Lake Province' dedicated to the worship of the crocodile-god Sebek. The Fayyum, owing to its proximity to Itht-toui, had engaged the attention of his predecessors from the time of Amenemhet I; the third Amenemhet regulated the outflow of its waters into the Nile by constructing a barrage at Lahun, and reclaimed a large expanse of its shallow waters by means of a huge curved dike. The great building at Hawara in the Fayyum (called 'the Labyrinth' by the classical authors) was built by him, and he was buried here in a pyramid. Some extraordinary statues and sphinxes of unique style, formerly attributed to the Hyksos, found at Tanis, and representing Nile-gods and possibly the king himself, were probably originally erected by him at Hawara, and later transported to Tanis by a Hyksos king. The extraordinarily rugged and original style of these monuments, if they are his, reflects the powerful mind of this king, who inherited all the vigour of the great Sesostris.

Sinai, the land of the turquoise and of copper, was much exploited by him, and we have numerous records on its rocks of expeditions sent thither during his reign. In Nubia he seems to have restored the old southern dominion in the Dongola province, which had been abandoned by Senusret III; and he built or rebuilt one of the twin brick fortresses called Defufa, at the Third Cataract (Kerma), which had been occupied as a trading outpost and *point d'appui* since the days of Pepi I, and where Hapzefi was buried with his native household in the time of Senusret I.

Imposing and stable must the constitution of Egypt have appeared in his reign. In his time, as has been said, all power was centred in the monarch, and the old hereditary chiefs of the nomes had been succeeded by a bureaucracy of town-mayors,

corresponding to the county-sheriffs of the IVth Dynasty. Yet, as so often occurred, when the state seemed most firmly organized, collapse was near. Its stability now depended on the personality of the king: if that failed, the whole fell to pieces. This was the case now. Amenemhet III was succeeded by a nonentity, Amenemhet IV, and he, after a reign of nine years alone, by a queen, Sebeknefrure. The latter reigned four years, and then probably married the founder of the XIIIth Dynasty, Khutouire Ugafa, whose personal name shows that he was a commoner or noble of another family, who assumed the crown in the right of his wife. His quite legal accession was not acknowledged at Thebes, which set up a king of its own, no doubt a junior male member of the royal family. Several Theban monarchs reigned, Senusret IV and several Mentuhoteps. They put up their statues at Karnak, but they are not mentioned in the lists, which recognize only Khutouire and his successors, who reigned at Itht-toui. They were devotees of Sebek, as the name Sebekhotep, characteristic of the family, shows. Egypt was once again divided.

The Turin Papyrus gives Khutouire no less than fourteen successors, all of them ephemeral, before Sebekhotep I, Sekhem-khutouire, reunited the land for a time. Two kings named Sebekemsaf then ruled Thebes alone, followed by Sebekhotep II, and the brothers Menuazre, Neferhotep and Sebekhotep III, who again controlled the whole country. These brethren appear to have been of plebeian origin, and it is evident that the royal succession was drifting into a very confused state. After their time the kingdom finally failed to reunite. At Thebes the royal house of later Intefs or Iniotefs, the most prominent of whom bore the throne-name Nubkheperre, preserved a comparatively powerful kingdom in the south; but the north was evidently the prey of civil war, until finally, in the reign of a king of the Delta whom Manetho calls Toutimaïos, belonging to the XIVth or Xoite dynasty, northern Egypt was enslaved by a foreign conqueror from Asia, Salitis, the first of the Hyksos or 'shepherd-kings' (c. 1800 B.C.).

## II THE HYKSOS

The Hyksos conquest was the greatest national disaster that ever befel the Egyptians until the Assyrian conquest a thousand years later. Its memory was never forgotten, and it left on the minds of the Egyptians an enduring hatred of the Asiatics, which transformed them, under the kings of the XVIIIth Dynasty, into

the vengeful conquerors of Asia. Never before had Egyptian territory been held for centuries by foreigners. And although the rulers of these foreigners dressed themselves in the titles and authority of native pharaohs, they were never accepted as rightful kings. Only for a short period did they succeed in conquering Upper Egypt and ruling the whole country. Thebes made a stout fight against them at the beginning under the later Intefs; and it was at Thebes under their descendants the Sekenenres that the national revolt began which ended in their final expulsion by the founder of the XVIIIth Dynasty, I'ahmases or Ahmose (Aahmes, Manetho's Amosis), an event which the great Jewish historian Josephus regarded, and justly, in the present writer's opinion, as the original of the biblical story of the Exodus (see pp. 164, 237).

The Hyksos were doubtless chiefly Semites of the northern or Syrian type, led by a royal sheikh. The name Hyksos is the Egyptian *Hiku-khasut* (pronounced in later times something like *hik-shōs*), 'princes of the deserts,' the usual appellation for bedouin chiefs. Abshai is so called in the tomb of Khnumhotep (p. 306). Indeed, Khayan, or Khian, the greatest of the Hyksos kings, actually has the title *hik-khasut*. Manetho translates the phrase as 'prince of the shepherds,' by confusion with another word, *shasu* ('bedouins'), who might well be described as shepherds, since the chief occupation of those Arabs who lived on the borders of Egypt was the breeding and herding of immense flocks of sheep. One sees the same thing in Mesopotamia to-day: the desert Arab, the camel and horse-breeder, despises the shepherd of the borderland of 'the sown.' It was to the horse and chariot, as well as to superior weapons, that the invaders owed their victory. Neither was known to the Egyptians before this invasion. One Egyptian word for 'horse,' *hitori*, really means 'yoked,' and refers to the yoking of the two steeds to the chariot, another, *sesem*, is apparently Semitic; and of the two foreign words for 'chariot,' *wererit* and *markabata*, the latter is Semitic.

This great invasion can very probably be traced to that epoch-making event, the first appearance of the Indo-Europeans on the Near Eastern stage. Shortly before 2000 B.C. the Aryans seem to have descended from the Oxus-land into Media, and made their presence felt on the eastern mountain-border of the Semitic kingdom of Babylon, the realm of the great law-giver Hammurabi and his successors. They brought with them from central Asia the horse, hitherto unknown to the Babylonians, who had previously gone to war in chariots drawn by asses (see pp. 107, 501). The Egyptian, although he had multitudes of asses, had never harnessed

them to wheeled carts. Babylon was taken and sacked by the Hittites (c. B.C. 1926?), who retired after their raid, carrying with them their spoil to distant Anatolia (p. 561). The derelict kingdom was subsequently pounced upon by the Kassites, who swarmed over the Zagros under Gandash, and founded a dynasty (Aryan) at Babylon which lasted for six centuries (see Chap. xv). Simultaneously, other Aryan tribes seem to have entered Mesopotamia further north; and in the region of the Khabur and Balikh the state of Mitanni was eventually set up, ruled by a royal house and aristocracy of horse-riding *Kharri* (?Aryans), and worshipping, as we know from cuneiform documents of the Amarna Age, the gods Indra, Varuna, and the Nasatya twins (the Ašvins). Moreover the chief god of the Kassites is said to have been *Shuriyash*, the Indian Surya (with nominative termination), the Sun (p. 553). This fact shows that the differentiation between Indian and Iranian Aryans had not yet taken place.

It is easy to imagine the confusion caused in northern Syria, already highly civilized, by the invasion. There would be a considerable displacement of the native population which would react further south. Waves of dispossessed Syrians must have flowed into Palestine, followed by bands of the *Kharri*, and it is highly significant that in the time of the XVIIIth Dynasty (1400 B.C.) we find in Palestine such names as Yashdata (Yazdāta) and Shuwardata (Sūryadāta, *i.e.* 'Given by the Sun': 'Heliodotos'). The congeries of nations, mingled Syrians, bedouins, and Aryans then burst the weak barrier of the 'Prince's Wall' that had hitherto sufficed to defend the Delta, and overwhelmed Egypt. These people neither knew Egypt nor revered her gods; they burnt and destroyed the temples and enslaved the people; the echo of their impious deeds moves Manetho in his day to passion; and the Delta, especially, was so ravaged that it did not recover till the time of the XIXth Dynasty, three or four centuries later. During the period of the XVIIIth its cities are hardly ever mentioned in the inscriptions. The Theban kings alone succeeded in stemming the torrent, and for a time preserved their independence. But murder and rapine could not go on for ever, and the chiefs of the newcomers assumed Egyptian royal dignity. The Hyksos kings reigned at Avaris (probably Pelusium). Another stronghold was at the place now known as Tell el-Yehudiyeh, 'the Mound of the Jewess' (near Zagazig), a name that may preserve a memory of the nationality of its builders. Memphis also was one of their chief seats.

The Hyksos may well have owed much of their success to their

bronze scimitars (pp. 319, 572). According to Manetho, they formed two dynasties, the XVth and XVIth. Naturally their names are ignored in the official lists. Manetho gives the names of their first kings, Salitis, Bnōn, Apakhnas, Apophis, Iannas, and Aseth, which have been identified with more or less success with various unplaced royal names that occur on scarabs and other relics of this period. It was probably somewhere about this time that the Theban king Intef Nubkheperre lived, who in a remarkable stela set up at Coptos tells us how he cursed root and branch 'Teti (let his name be anathema!), son of Minhotep,' who had received 'the enemy' in the temple of Coptos. 'Let him be expelled from his office in the temple: even unto his son's son and the heir of his heir let him be cast forth. Take his loaves and sacred food: let not his name be remembered in this temple, as is done to one who like him hath transgressed with regard to the Enemy of his God!' Evidently Teti was a priest who had received an emissary of the Hyksos or possibly had even admitted a Hyksos garrison into Coptos.

There were certainly several kings of the name Apophis, in Egyptian Apopi. The first of these was pretty certainly he who bore the significant throne-name of Neb-kheperesh, 'Lord of the Scimitar.' Apopi II Ouserre, and Apopi III Okenenre, were of later date, and among the last of the Hyksos. Between the earlier group vouched for by Manetho and the later Apophis came several less distinguished kings bearing Semitic names, Yekeb-hal ('Jacob is god'), Yekeb-ba'al ('Jacob is lord'), 'Ant-hal ('Anath is god'), and then Khian, who bore the Egyptian throne-name Seuserenre (see p. 232). He took the unusual title of *ink-idebu*, 'Embracer of Territories,' and proclaimed himself as the *hik-khasut*. The alabastron-lid bearing his name found at Cnossus in Crete may well be an importation of his time; the small stone lion with his throne-name from Baghdad may have been brought from Egypt at a much later date. Neither proves that his power reached Crete or Babylon. But he was undoubtedly a powerful monarch, and there is little doubt that under him Theban independence no longer existed. His successor Apopi II recorded his rule at Gebelēn in Upper Egypt, south of Thebes. This king also set up great gates in the temple of Tanis in the Delta, and we have a record of the thirty-third year of his reign in the subscription of a mathematical papyrus.

A doubtful king, Setopehti Nubti, commemorated by Ramses II as having reigned 400 years before his time, will if he is a king at all, and not merely the god Set (Sutekh) himself, belong to

about this time (c. 1700 B.C.). There is also Osehre, who erected an obelisk at Tanis, and Apopi III, in whose time the final war broke out with Thebes that resulted in the Expulsion of the Hyksos. A tributary king Seḳenenre I, Taa, 'the great,' who bore the Egyptian royal titles, reigned at Thebes about forty years before the Expulsion, and in his reign the War of Liberation probably began. About 1615 B.C. he was succeeded by Seḳenenre II, Taa, 'the twice-great,' who was shortlived, and was followed perhaps about 1605 by Seḳenenre III, Taa, 'the great and victorious,' who was either killed in battle or assassinated (probably about 1590), as we know from the appearance of his mummy, now in the Cairo Museum. The actual manner of his death and the order in which he received the blows that struck him down can be reconstituted from examination of the mummy. He married a princess named Iaḥḥotep, and by her had three sons, Kamases (Kames), Senekhtenre, and Iaḥmases (Amosis or Ahmose), who succeeded each other in order on the throne, the last being the liberator and founder of the XVIIIth Dynasty.

At the beginning of the reign of Seḳenenre III a temporary peace existed between the two powers, probably after a struggle that had resulted in the pushing forward, in the reign of Seḳenenre I, of the Theban power at least as far northwards as Hermopolis. For it is in that reign that the queen Iaḥḥotep was born, and with her begins, so far as we know, the popularity of names connected with the moon (Iaḥḥotep, Iaḥmases) and the moon-god Thoth (Thutmases, Thutmose or Tethmosis) in his family. It would seem probable therefore, either that the family was of Hermopolite origin, or, as is more likely, that in the reign of Seḳenenre I the Thebans had captured Ekhmūnū (Hermopolis Magna), and then adopted the lunar names, in honour of the liberated god. However this may be, in the time of Seḳenenre III Thebes was still tributary to the Hyksos. Contemporaneously with Seḳenenre III reigned the Hyksos Apopi III; and from a papyrus we learn that war broke out between the two owing to the provocation of the Hyksos, who complained that the roaring of the hippopotami in the royal tank at Thebes disturbed his sleep at Avaris. Since 'the white land' was tributary to him, he sent to the King of the South to request an abatement of the nuisance. Seḳenenre summoned his counsellors, who knew not what to advise him to reply to the Hyksos, good or ill. He no doubt endeavoured to placate his overlord with fair words, but Apopi was bent on war, which resulted disastrously for the Theban. In the reign of Kames we know that the Theban dominion reached

only as far as Cusae, which is a long way south of Hermopolis. The war is described by Manetho as a long and mighty one. It must have greatly resembled that waged by the original Thebans against the Heracleopolites five centuries or so before, and was no doubt carried on intermittently and with various success. Kames, however, must have again renewed it, and it is probable that he took Memphis, the capture of which is not mentioned under Amosis (Iahmases), who took the war into the Delta. He captured Avaris and, after a siege of three years, Sharuhén in the Negeb of southern Palestine, where the remnant of the Hyksos had congregated.

We do not know the name of the last Hyksos king. From the inscription of Aahmes, a companion of the king, we know that a certain Aati invaded Egypt south of the Delta while Amosis was absent, after the taking of Sharuhén, in a punitive expedition against the Nubians. This may have been an attempt on the part of the expelled to regain their position. Amosis easily defeated him. Another enemy named Teti-an, who was then 'extinguished' (as the inscription says), was pretty certainly an Egyptian rebel. Thenceforth the land had peace, and entered into the flourishing period of the 'New Kingdom,' reunited under the rule of Amosis and his descendants, the kings of Manetho's XVIIIth Dynasty. The accession of Amosis can be dated within a few years either way to 1580 B.C. Avaris was taken about 1578, and Sharuhén about 1575 B.C. With these historical dates our survey of the earlier period of Egyptian history closes.

### III. THE INTERNAL CONDITIONS OF THE AGE

The debatable point with regard to the Egyptian Middle Kingdom, the history of which has been briefly described above, is its date: the period of time which it covered (see p. 169). We have followed in a modified form the shorter chronology which at present is accepted by the majority of Egyptologists. It is impossible to believe that the events of the Middle Kingdom, the essential outlines of which we have given, can fill out the fifteen hundred years that are necessitated by the 'long' chronology, as against the four or five hundred at most that the 'short' chronology demands. There is not the material to fill the longer period; and the differences between the early XVIIIth Dynasty and the XIIth are not such as would inevitably be seen if eighteen hundred years had intervened between them instead of only four hundred. After all, four hundred years is a pretty long period of time, in which all



the changes we see between the civilizations of the two periods may easily have been brought about. We hold therefore that the period of the Middle Kingdom, which ended certainly within a few years either way of 1580 B.C., began with the XIth Dynasty, not earlier than about 2400, the XIIth having flourished between 2212 and 2000 B.C.

Within these limits the Middle Kingdom forms a well-defined epoch of ancient Egyptian civilization. In some respects it may be regarded as marking its culmination. Remarkable as are the revelations of late years with regard to the art of the Old Kingdom, that of the XIIth Dynasty still holds its place as the classic age of the sculptor, the painter, the wood-carver, and the jeweller of ancient Egypt. And the Middle Kingdom is the classical period of the Egyptian language. Its correct literary form is now fixed until the time of the Ramessids, when the current 'slang' locutions of the day were first admitted into formal inscriptions. Under the XVIIIth Dynasty official phraseology and book-talk, 'classical Egyptian,' differed from the usual speech of ordinary life much as happens to-day; the speech of the XIIth Dynasty was still used for formal purposes as that of the eighteenth century is now. But under the XIIth Dynasty the language of the inscriptions, the classical tongue, was the ordinary language of the time. It is in the inscriptions of the Middle Kingdom that we find the language in its greatest purity. So far as material civilization went, we perhaps do not see much advance upon the standard of the Old Kingdom. Under the XVIIIth Dynasty Egypt entered upon an altogether widened world, with immeasurably increased demands and hitherto unheard-of satisfactions. The Middle Kingdom was still in the same stage of development as the Old, so far as foreign relations were concerned and the broadening (and degeneration) of culture that resulted therefrom. Egypt was still, as in the days of the Pyramid-builders, self-contained. She needed nothing from others but big timber, oil and wine from Syria, for which she bartered the contents of her overflowing granaries and some of the gold which her Nubian slaves got for her. For her actual subsistence she raised more than all that was necessary: her imports were a few luxuries. She was self-sufficient, and needed no foreign gods, foreign wives, and foreign ways such as came to her later in the time of the conquering kings of the XVIIIth Dynasty.

Egypt in the time of the XIIth Dynasty was still a world by itself, ruled by a god in human form, as it had been in the time of the Pyramid-builders, and there was as yet no comity with other non-Egyptian, political organizations as there was in the time of

the XVIIIth Dynasty, when the king of Egypt addressed the king of Hatti, of Mitanni, of Babylon, or of Assyria, as 'Monsieur mon Frère... je suis de Votre Majesté le bon frère.' We may compare the pharaohs of the XIIth Dynasty, in relation to the outer world of Babylon, of Elam, or of the Hittites, the world of Hammurabi and his predecessors, with the great Chinese emperors of the eighteenth century, with K'ang-hsi and Chien-lung, in their relation to the outer world of England, France and Holland, before the catastrophe of the wars of the nineteenth century proved to China, as the Hyksos conquest had to Egypt so many thousand years before, that there were other people in the world besides herself. We shall not therefore look for any great difference between the Old and Middle Kingdoms of Egypt so far as the general life of the people is concerned. We have seen in both ages change and evolution in local government, alternate periods of strength and weakness of the central royal power, corresponding to periods of weakness and strength of local magnates, of whom some one fortunate or more than usually energetic family may succeed in acquiring the royal authority itself, and, as the reigning house, may eventually extinguish the local power of less successful princely families originally perhaps more important than itself. But whether the pharaoh was powerful or weak, whether dues were paid to the court or to the chief, the life of the fellah has continued practically unchanged throughout the centuries.

So far as the life of the common people is concerned, Egypt is the most amazingly unchanging country in the world, it has changed less even than China. The life of the fellah of the XIIth or even of the IVth Dynasty is much the same as it is to-day. The change of religion to Christianity and then to Islam has altered nothing but the form of prayer: the changes of political allegiance have mattered nothing at all. The agricultural and urban classes were differentiated just as they are to-day. The 'Story of the Eloquent Peasant,' which dates from the XIIth Dynasty, tells us of the relations between the *hemtiu* or artisans of the towns and the *sekhti* or fellahin. Many wrongs and indignities did a certain long-suffering *sekhti* of the Fayyum bear from an overbearing *hemti*, till at last he complained to the royal high-steward, Meruitensi. On the steward's report of the matter, the king told his nobles to see how many times the *sekhti* would make complaint, if nothing was done. Again and again he came until finally so charmed were the nobles with his importunate eloquence that the *hemti* at last got his deserts (see p. 349). The lot of the *sekhti* was hard. As now, they rarely moved their habitat, and

were practically tied to the land, which belonged either to the king or to the great feudatories, and after the Middle Kingdom also to the great priestly corporations. They were serfs, but not slaves. The latter were chiefly foreign war-prisoners, and it is perhaps to colonies of Nubian prisoners that we may ascribe the peculiar 'pan-grave' burials, with their Nubian pottery, that occur in Egypt at this period. The Theban kings of Hyksos times seem to have lost control over Nubia, and we find the ancient trading settlement of the Defufa-fortresses, which had been founded in the reign of Pepi I, destroyed by fire in the Hyksos period, probably in a negro revolt. We have seen that one of the first tasks of Ahmose after the expulsion of the Hyksos, was the restoration of Egyptian dominion in Nubia and of the commerce in gold, ostrich-feathers, and slaves which had contributed so much to the wealth of the XIIth Dynasty kings.

The forbidding of private war by Amenemhet I and his successors certainly bettered the condition of the common people, as their lot must have been miserable during the dark age of civil war that preceded the triumph of the Thebans. No doubt they were better off during the period that immediately ensued, when the land had peace; but the old local princes, who would be sympathetic to their own peasants and retainers, still ruled their nomes. The abolition of hereditary jurisdictions however, probably by Senusret III, and development of a local bureaucracy, probably by Amenemhet III, must, though it operated admirably in the interests of the monarch, have often borne hardly on the fellahin, who would now be exposed to the exactions of petty officials. But a new element in the state had now appeared, which rendered the change from feudalism to bureaucracy easier than otherwise it would have been. This was a real middle-class of free townsmen and small landholders, which had not existed under the Old Kingdom. These people could supply the army of scribes and officials necessary for the new régime.

The supremacy of the authority of the court meant that the king's vizier and his myrmidons resumed a power that they had not possessed since the days of the IVth Dynasty. It paved the way for the elaborate bureaucratic state-organization which we find under the XVIIIth, with its two viziers, its independent treasurer, its royal assessors, its local courts of justice, and so forth, all ultimately under the control of the viziers, but with various checks and balances devised to prevent the danger of too great a concentration of power in the hands of subjects. The vizier under the XIIth Dynasty was head of the civil administra-

tion of the south and north. Under him were 'the great ones of the southern Tens' (an ancient title the precise meaning of which escapes us) who supervised all records for purposes of land-measurement, taxation and corvée. The yearly obliteration of landmarks caused by the inundation necessitated then as now an enormous amount of survey and adjudicatory work. The vizier also supervised the law-courts, the six 'Great Houses' and the 'House of the Thirty,' and he could be High Treasurer also, a position which was never permitted under the XVIIIth Dynasty, when the vizier had no control of the public purse. The XIIth Dynasty vizier was by no means always a stationary minister, resident always at the court or capital. He was often sent out on expeditions to fetch gold or chastise Nubians, and was expected to act in a military capacity when required.

The armed force of the court was a body of regular infantry soldiers, many of them Sudanese, recruited for the king's service, and stationed at various places, chiefly no doubt at Itht-toui, in Nubia, and in Sinai, under commanders who had been brought up at the court under the royal eye. During the first half of the dynasty the local princes also had their own armed retainers, whom the king could call out on his service under the leadership of their lords, as under the VIth and VIIth Dynasties. But these fell into desuetude with the privileges of their masters. The chief arms were, as under the Old Kingdom, the bow (a very weak one) and arrows (with heads of flint still, or hardened wood), the broad-bladed spear, long bill, and small hatchet (usually of copper, but bronze is beginning to appear), and a short sword or dagger of bronze with a peculiar hilt of ivory let into the metal. Swords and hatchets were often inlaid with gold. Towards the end of the Middle Kingdom a new form of bronze sword, or rather scimitar (*khepesh*), of peculiar kinked form, was introduced, perhaps by the Hyksos. It later became the most favourite arm. The stone-headed mace of the Old Kingdom was no longer used (p. 572).

In connexion with weapons it may be said that the Egyptians passed from the Chalcolithic to the Copper Age about the time of the IVth Dynasty, and from the Copper Age to the fully-developed Bronze Age during the Middle Kingdom. Under the XIIth Dynasty stone was still employed for the cheapest of knives used by the fellahin for chopping up meat, etc., and for the arrow-heads which once shot off would never be recovered. Razors and fine daggers, however, were now of finely-tempered bronze, ordinary knives and weapons of copper. Horses and chariots were unknown till the Hyksos conquest (above, p. 311); but they

were speedily adopted by the Egyptians, and no doubt used by the Thebans in the war of liberation. But it can be seen that their use in Egypt must always have been hampered by the peculiarities of the terrain. Nilotic warfare was conducted on ship-board, and it was the river flotilla rather than the array of chariots that was the chief weapon of war-makers in Egypt. Not until they carried warfare into Palestine in pursuit of the fleeing Hyksos did the Egyptians realize the full value of the chariot. It was no doubt owing to the difficulty of using their chariots in Egypt that the Hyksos did not at the first rush conquer the whole valley as far south as Nubia.

The popular idea of the Egyptians as no sailors and as afraid of the sea is entirely erroneous. The Egyptians fought well at Salamis and at Navarino: the Ptolemaic navy ruled the seas. And in the early days they sailed to Phoenicia in the time of Snefru or earlier, and to Somaliland under the VIth Dynasty. Under the XIIth the voyages of Enenkhet and Henu were often repeated. Egyptian trading and revictualling settlements existed all along the Red Sea coast, and ships were always coasting from one to the other on the way to or from Puenet. As usual, the sailor-mind developed many a tale of the wonders of the voyage, one of which is known to us, 'the Story of the Shipwrecked Sailor,' and is of this period (see p. 348).

On land the ass formed the sole means of carrying, and the ox of dragging transport. The camel, though it must have been known, is never represented. It was the animal of the bedouins and was probably regarded as specially unclean. The ass was never harnessed to a cart. The wheel was not an Egyptian invention. The sledge-runner was universal as the under-carriage of man-drawn carts until the introduction of the chariot at the end of the Middle Kingdom. In all probability the cart-wheel was first invented by the Sumerians or the Elamites. The potter's wheel also may have come from the same source, as it does not appear in Egypt till well on in the Old Kingdom, but was evidently used much earlier in Elam. On the other hand, the Egyptian was the inventor of the art of glazing pottery. Glass, originally always blue, made from copper-frit, was an Egyptian discovery of late predynastic days. The blue glaze was used to coat not only the light faience of siliceous sand held together with gum or paste, but soft stone also, such as steatite, of which blue glazed scarabs, imitating lapis or turquoise, were first made towards the end of the Old Kingdom, and came into regular use in the reign of Senusret I. See p. 576.

Artists of all kinds found ample scope for their talents in the

decoration of the tomb and its appurtenances. We see a notable development in the furniture of the Middle Kingdom tomb that marks it off from the tombs of the preceding and succeeding periods. With the great wooden chests containing the body, often sealed up in a covering of cartonnage (pasted thicknesses of linen covered with stucco), painted in imitation of the human face and form, were buried innumerable wooden models of varying excellence of workmanship, depicting the dead man's ghostly servants engaged in field-labours, emptying sacks of corn into granaries, grinding the grain, making beer of it, stamping out the grapes to make wine, butchering animals, carrying dead wild fowl, and so on, while models of boats with sails of linen complete are always present with little wooden soldiers, Egyptians and negroes, on board with their cow-hide shields and their spears, and a deck-house in which sits a small figure of the great man himself. All these, like the wall-decorations of the larger tombs (now usually painted in tempera rather than sculptured in relief as under the Old Kingdom), had a 'magical' purpose. They were intended to turn into actual servants in the next world, to carry on a life for the dead like that which he had led on earth.

We now for the first time find in the tombs, though rarely, the *shauabti* (*ushabti*)-figures, or 'answerers,' which in later times were the commonest accompaniment of the dead. These were supposed, as stated by the VIth chapter of the Book of the Dead, which later on was inscribed upon them, to answer 'Here am I!' whenever the dead man was called upon to do any work in the other world. They possibly represent the servants who in early days had been actually put to death in order to serve their masters beyond the grave. We know that in Nubia slaves were executed at the tomb with this object; and it is by no means certain that in the case of the burial of the king inhuman rites of this kind were not still practised during the Middle Kingdom. The priestess-princesses who were buried in the precinct of the tomb-temple of Nebhapatre at Dēr el-Bahri were very probably his harem-women, killed and buried with him. And the enigmatic bodies found with the big funeral boat in the tomb of Amenhotep II, under the XVIIIth Dynasty, may also have been slain royal favourites. This boat is the last known example of the custom of burying such models with the dead, which had died out by the beginning of the XVIIIth Dynasty.

The custom of mummification was as yet by no means common, bodies of this period being usually found as skeletons. But the wrappings of fine linen (one of the oldest Egyptian inventions)

had been in use from the time of the Old Kingdom, and a special goddess, Tait, presided over their manufacture and use. To be buried in such, and to wear linen garments in life, were the mark of the civilized Egyptian, who prided himself much on the purity and cleanliness of his garments and his clean-shaven face and head, as compared with the greasy woollen or skin habiliments and the hairiness of foreigners. The wig was a concession to nature; it was worn also by women, but over their own hair. Boys, and sometimes little girls, wore three-quarters of the head shaven, while a single plaited lock hung over the right ear. This was the symbol of youth; the boy-god Harpocrates was represented with it, and the fashion never changed.

The *mastaba*-tomb was now given up, and the great were buried in rock-cut sepulchres opening in the sloping face of the desert-cliffs bounding the river valley. The king, however, was still buried in a pyramid, though he might, like Senusret III, have a duplicate tomb cut in the rock at Abydos, or like Nebhapatre have a dummy pyramid as a mere ornament to his tomb-chapel, the actual rock-cut tomb being in the cliff. Persons of lesser note than the feudal nobles were buried in tomb-chambers opening out of the bottom of a deep shaft.

Under the Middle Kingdom the religion of the dead was bulking more and more in the Egyptian mind. Osiris, originally Syrian (pp. 264, 333) now came to his kingdom. If the new god Amon-Re took command of the pantheon, the Delta god of the dead, known during the Old Kingdom only in Lower Egypt, was now paramount among the shades. Osiris had passed from Busiris to Sakkarah in the Pyramid-period, and had become identified with the local Sokari; by the time of the XIIth Dynasty he had taken over Abydos from its original owner, the jackal Anubis, with his title of Khentamentiu. The very ancient funerary prayer (the *neset-di-hetep* formula), in which the king is besought to give the funerary, meals and everything 'good and pure' on which the dead man lives, in the presence of Anubis, is now addressed primarily to Osiris, 'great god, lord of Abydos,' and the invocation of the king has become a meaningless phrase. The Busirite doctrine of the identification of the dead person, male or female, with the god, so that every dead man or woman or child became *ipso facto* a god, 'the god there,' 'the Osiris *N* or *M*,' is now in full vogue at Abydos as well as at Sakkarah; Osiris is the 'universal lord' of the dead, the *neb-er-zer* or 'Lord as far as the boundary,' and every Egyptian adores him. Abydos has become a place of common pilgrimage: all would wish to be buried there; those great ones

who cannot sleep at Abydos have stelae put up there in their honour (p. 350). It is more than probable that this national devotion to Osiris at Abydos was deliberately encouraged by the kings of the XIIth Dynasty in order to foster a feeling of common nationality under Upper Egyptian auspices: the worship of Osiris and that of Amon-Re would go hand in hand. But the latter was not yet the universal god of the living as Osiris was of the dead. For the religious purposes of daily life the people preferred their own local deities. But in imitation of Amon, we find the custom beginning of identifying such local divinities as Sebek with Re.

There was as yet no priestly class in the later sense, except at the necropolises, where the chantry-priests of the Old Kingdom had developed into cemetery-chaplains. The temples were now served by professional chief priests instead of nobles assuming the sacerdotal dignity, as under the Old Kingdom. But they were few in number, all the subordinate priests being laymen who performed priestly duties. It is not till the time of the XVIIIth Dynasty that the great priestly college of Amon-Re at Thebes appears, which was to be imitated on a smaller scale in every temple throughout the land, so that in the days of Herodotus they had come to resemble a caste apart.

Whether this development of the XVIIIth Dynasty was native to Egypt and Thebes, or whether it was a foreign idea, derived possibly from Syria or Anatolia, we do not know. One later development of Egyptian religion, and that a heretical one, may perhaps be due to Semitic influence: *viz.* monotheism. The henotheistic worship of a god was common enough, but monotheism, whether patent or latent, was unknown to the native religion. We see it first in Egypt as a characteristic of the Semitic Hyksos kings; Apopi III 'took Sutekh for his lord and served no other god in all the land but he,' says the chronicler of the quarrel of the two kings. Sutekh was a god of the desert edge in the region of Lake Menzaleh and Pelusium: he was more than half Syrian and identical with a Semitic Baal (pp. 231 *sq.*, 275). During the Middle Kingdom he seems to have become identified with the Upper Egyptian god Set of Ombos; and in later times is depicted sometimes in Syrian guise and sometimes as Set. The Hyksos worshipped him as their patron-deity; and, in consequence, Set, who was already unpopular except at Ombos, owing to the old tradition of his hostility to Horus, became anathema to the Egyptians. His enmity to Horus took in a new meaning: he became the murderer of Osiris; his worship was proscribed. Under the XVIIIth Dynasty he never appears. But monotheistic traditions remained in the



Delta after the expulsion of the Hyksos, and we shall find them developing at Heliopolis, always receptive of eastern influence, until, centuries later, under Amenhotep III and IV we have the monotheistic adoration of the *aton* or solar disk as the living manifestation of the one god behind the sun. But to the Egyptian such monotheism was as abhorrent as Apopi's worship of Sutekh had been. The Egyptian always worshipped many gods, and when, as is sometimes the case in religious hymns, he appears to be praising one alone, it is henotheistic praise, not monotheistic.

In religious literature the chapters of the Book of Coming Forth by Day were increasing in number, in complexity, and in unintelligibility. But no doubt they fulfilled admirably their purpose, that of a guide to the devious ways of the next world. Sometimes at this time we find elaborate maps of the *Duat* or underworld painted with accompanying texts on the inside of coffins.

Besides the literature already referred to (see further, Chap. ix) we have a more human and more interesting memorial of the Egyptian feeling with regard to death in a poem of this time, which was said to have been inscribed in front of the relief figure of a harper 'in the tomb-chapel of king Intef, deceased.' We do not know which of the kings of this name is meant. The harper was evidently supposed to sing the song, which has been likened to the Dirge of Manerōs, which, Herodotus says, was chanted while the mummy-figure was carried round the feast:

All hail to the prince, the good man,  
Whose body must pass away,  
~~While~~ his children remain for aye.

The gods of old rest in their tombs,  
And the mummies of men long dead;  
The same for both rich and poor.

The words of Imhotep I hear,  
The words of Hordedef, which say:—  
'What is prosperity? tell!'

Their fences and walls are destroyed,  
Their houses exist no more;  
And no man cometh again from the tomb  
To tell of what passeth below.

Ye go to the place of the mourners,  
To the bourne whence none return;  
Strengthen your hearts to forget your joys,  
Yet fulfil your desires while ye live.

Anoint yourselves, clothe yourselves well,  
Use the gifts which the gods bestow,  
Fulfil your desires upon earth.

For the day will come to you all  
When ye hear not the voices of friends,  
When weeping avails you no more.  
So feast in tranquillity now,  
For none taketh his goods below to the tomb,  
And none cometh thence back again!

'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die!' The refrain echoes down the ages from the time of king Intef. The pathetic character of the whole Egyptian care for the dead strikes one more and more: they took such pains to secure their own and their friends' happiness in the unknown; they persuaded themselves that they knew all about it, and wrote magic guide-books to it. But the truth came out in the Song of the Harper. Yet this pathetic solicitude for the dead is evidence of a far higher culture, of a far greater humanity in the best sense of the word, in Egypt than among the Semites, with their wretched Sheol, and their comparatively primitive burings. Sinuhe chose well when at the close of his life he decided that he would not be buried in a sheep-skin like a bedouin, but would return to enter his swept and garnished tomb, to receive his mummy-swathings from the hand of Tait, and sleep in his great coffin of painted wood with his boats and his models of servants about him.

The first period of the history of Ancient Egypt was brought to an end by a catastrophe which subjected the land to cruel foreign conquerors. The disaster may well have seemed to be foreshadowed in the weird prophecies of Ipuwer, which foretold dire calamities to come upon the land, the overthrow of the state, the invasion of foreigners, and the destruction of all civilization, followed by the advent of a Messianic ruler who should save Egypt from her misery (pp. 341, 345 *sq.*). This saviour might well have seemed to come in the persons of the Liberator and his descendants, the kings of the XVIIIth Dynasty.

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abh.	Abhandlungen.
Abh. K.M.	Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes.
A.J.A.	American Journal of Archaeology.
A.J.Ph.	American Journal of Philology.
A.J.S.L.	American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures.
A.S.A.E.	Annales du Service des antiquités de l'Égypte.
Ath. Mitt.	Mittheilungen des deutschen arch. Inst., Athenische Abtheilung.
B. z. Ass.	Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft.
B.C.H.	Bulletin de Correspondance hellénique.
B.I.C.	Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale au Caire.
Bay. S.B.	Sitzungsberichte d. bayerischen Akad. d. Wissenschaften.
Berl. S.B.	Sitzungsberichte d. preuss. Akad. d. Wissenschaften zu Berlin.
Biblica	Biblica. Commentarii editi a Pontificio Instituto Biblico, Rome.
B.S.A.	Annual of the British School at Athens.
B.S.R.	Papers of the British School at Rome.
Bull. d. I.	Bullettino dell' Istituto.
C.I.G.	Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum.
C.I.L.	Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.
C.I.S.	Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum.
C.J.	Classical Journal.
C.Q.	Classical Quarterly.
C.R.	Classical Review.
C.R. Ac. Inscr.	Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions.
D.B.	Dictionary of the Bible (J. Hastings, Edinburgh, 1898).
E.Bi.	Encyclopaedia Biblica.
E.Brit.	Encyclopaedia Britannica. Ed. XI.
E.H.R.	English Historical Review.
E.R.E.	Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics.
Exp. T.	Expository Times.
Ἐφ. Ἀρχ.	Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική.
F.H.G.	C. Müller, Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum.
G.G.A.	Göttingsche Gelehrte Anzeigen.
Geogr. Z.	Geographische Zeitschrift.
Head H.N.	Head, Historia Numorum, 2nd Ed. 1912.
Herm.	Hermes.
I.G.F.	Indogermanische Forschungen.
J.A.	Journal Asiatique.
J.A.O.S.	Journal of the American Oriental Society
J.B.S.	Journal of Biblical Studies.
J.D.A.I.	Jahrbuch des deutschen archäologischen Instituts.
J.E.A.	Journal of Egyptian Archaeology.
J.H.S.	Journal of Hellenic Studies.
J. Man. E.O.S.	Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society.
J.R.A.I.	Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute.
J.R.A.S.	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.
J.R.S.	Journal of Roman Studies.
J.S.O.R.	Journal of the Society of Oriental Research.

Klio	Klio (Beiträge zur alten Geschichte).
Liv. A.A.	Liverpool Annals of Archaeology.
M.B.B.A.	Monatsbericht der Berliner Akademie.
M.D.O.G.	Mittheilungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft.
M.D.P.V.	Mittheilungen des deutschen Palästinavereins.
M.V.A.G.	Mittheilungen der vordrasiatischen Gesellschaft.
Mon. d. I.	Monumenti Antichi dell' Istituto.
N.J. Kl. Alt.	Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum.
N.J.P.	Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie.
N.S.A.	Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità (Atti d. r. Accad. dei Lincei).
Num. Chr.	Numismatic Chronicle.
Num. Z.	Numismatische Zeitschrift.
O.L.Z.	Orientalische Literaturzeitung.
P.E.F.	Palestine Exploration Fund.
Phil.	Philologus.
P.S.B.A.	Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology.
P.W.	Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft.
Πρ.	Πρακτικά.
Q.S.	Quarterly Statement(s).
Rec. Trav.	Recueil de Travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptienne et assyrienne.
Rev. A.	Revue archéologique.
Rev. Ass.	Revue d'Assyriologie.
Rev. Bib.	Revue biblique internationale.
Rev. Eg.	Revue égyptologique.
Rev. E.G.	Revue des études grecques.
Rev. H.	Revue historique.
Rev. N.	Revue numismatique.
Rh. Mus.	Rheinisches Museum für Philologie.
Riv. Fil.	Rivista di Filologia.
Riv. N.O.	Rivista nuova orientale.
Röm. Mith.	Mittheilungen des deutschen arch. Inst., Römische Abtheilung.
R.V.	Revised Version.
R.V. mg.	Revised Version margin.
S.B.	Sitzungsberichte.
Syria.	Syria: Revue d'art oriental et d'archéologie.
T.S.B.A.	Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology.
W.Z.K.M.	Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes.
Wien S.B.	Sitzungsberichte d. Akad. d. Wissenschaften in Wien.
Wien St.	Wiener Studien.
Z.A.	Zeitschrift für Assyriologie.
Z. Aeg.	Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde.
Z.A.T.W.	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.
Z.D.M.G.	Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft.
Z.D.P.V.	Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins.
Z.E.	Zeitschrift für Ethnologie.
Z.G. f. E.	Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde.
Z.N.	Zeitschrift für Numismatik.

## CHAPTER VIII

EGYPT: THE MIDDLE KINGDOM<sup>1</sup>

## (a) GENERAL

General Histories and sources as in bibliography of Ch. VII.

## (b) SOURCES

- Gardiner, A. H. *New Literary Works* (Instructions of a Herakleopolite king). J.E.A., 1914, pp. 20 *sqq.*  
 ——— *The Defeat of the Hyksos*. J.E.A., 1916, pp. 95 *sqq.*  
 Griffith, F. Ll. *Instructions of Amenemhet*. Z. Aeg., 1896, pp. 35 *sqq.*  
 Gunn, B., and A. H. Gardiner. *The Expulsion of the Hyksos*. J.E.A., 1918, pp. 36 *sqq.*  
 Hall, H. R. *Anc. Hist. Near East* (1920); pp. 142-4 (XIth Dyn.); 148-9 (XIIth Dyn.); 165-7 (XIIIth Dyn.); 212-26 (Hyksos period); 403-9 (the Hyksos and the Exodus).  
 ——— *Hieroglyphic Texts in British Museum*, II-VI. 1912-22.  
 Krebs, F. *De Chnemothis Nomarchi Inscriptione*. Berlin, 1890.  
 Maspero, G. *La XII<sup>e</sup> Dynastie de Manéthon*. Rec. Trav., 1906, p. 8.  
 Meyer, E. *Nachträge zur äg. Chronologie*. 1907.  
 Newberry, P. G. *The Parentage of Queen Aahhetep*. P.S.B.A., 1912, p. 285.  
 Peet, T. E. *The Stele of Sebek-khu*. 1914.  
 Pieper, M. *Könige zwischen d. M. und N. Reich*. Berlin, 1904.  
 Reisner, G. F. *Outline of Anc. Hist. of the Sudan*. Sudan Notes and Records. 1918.  
 Steindorff, G. *Die Könige Mentuhotep u. Antef*. Z. Aeg., 1895, pp. 72 *sqq.*  
 Weill, A. *Monuments, etc., entre la fin de la XII<sup>e</sup> Dyn. et la restauration Thébaine*. J.A.S., 1914, 1915, 1917. (Valuable for material; theories and conclusions generally open to criticism. Cf. Pieper, O.L.Z., 1922, No. 3.)

## (c) MISCELLANEOUS HISTORICAL

- Blackman, A. M. *A reference to Sesostris III's Syrian Campaign*. J.E.A., 1915, p. 13.  
 Daressy, G. *Un Poignard du temps des Rois-Pasteurs*. Ann. Serv., 1906, p. 115.  
 Evans, Sir A. J. *The Palace of Minos*, I. 1921. (Relations with Greece.)  
 Gardiner, A. H. *An ancient list of fortresses of Nubia*. J.E.A., 1916, pp. 184 *sqq.*  
 ——— *The Delta Residence of the Ramessides*. J.E.A., 1918, pp. 127 *sqq.*  
 ——— *The Tomb of an Egyptian Official*. J.E.A., 1917, p. 28.  
 Golénischeff, W. *Amenemha III et les sphinx de Sān*. Rec. Trav., 1893, p. 131.  
 Hall, H. R. *The Relation of Aegean with Egyptian Art*. J.E.A., 1914, pp. 110, 197. (Relations with Greece.)  
 Junker, H. *The First Appearance of Negroes in History*. J.E.A., 1921, p. 12. (Theory needs confirmation.)  
 Lange, H. O. *Inschriften des Gaufürsten Intf von Hermonthis*. S.B. Berlin, 1914, pp. 991 *sqq.*

<sup>1</sup> See footnote on p. 637.

- Maspero, Sir G. Conte d'Apopi et de Soknounri. *Étud. Ég.*, 1881.  
 Meyer, E. Die Israeliten u. ihre Nachbarstämme. Halle, 1906. (Relations with Palestine.)  
 Petrie, W. M. F. Historical Studies. 1911.  
 Pinches, T., and P. E. Newberry. A Cylinder Seal in the Carnarvon Collection. *J.E.A.*, 1921, p. 196.  
 Sayce, A. H. The Date of the Middle Empire. *Anc. Eg.*, 1921, p. 102. (Inconclusive.)  
 Sethe, K. Sesostri: Untersuchungen. 1900.  
 —, Zur ältesten Geschichte des äg. Seeverkehrs mit Byblos, etc. *Z. Aeg.*, 1908, p. 7.

## (d) ARCHAEOLOGY

- Boeser, P. A. Beschreibung der äg. Sammlung des Museums in Leiden, II, III. 1909, 1910.  
 Brunton, G. Lahun I. 1921.  
 Carnarvon, Lord, and H. Carter. Five Years' Explorations at Thebes. 1912.  
 Clarke, Somers. Ancient Egyptian Frontier Fortresses. *J.E.A.*, 1916, pp. 155-177.  
 Daressy, G. La Chapelle de Mentouhotep III à Dendérah. *Ann. Serv.*, 1917, p. 326.  
 Davies, N. de G., and A. H. Gardiner. The Tomb of Antefoker. 1920.  
 Engelbach, R. Riqqeh. 1915.  
 Firth, C. M. Archaeological Survey of Nubia. Reports, especially 1907-8, 1909-10.  
 Gardiner, A. H. The Egyptian Origin of the Semitic Alphabet. *J.E.A.*, 1916, p. 1.  
 Garstang, J. Egyptian Funerary Customs. 1907. (Excavations at Beni Hasan.)  
 Griffith, F. Ll. The Oxford Excavations in Nubia. *Liv. A.A.*, 1921, p. 65.  
 Junker, H. Grabungen von Kubanieh-Nord. *Denkschr. Ak. Wiss. Wien*, 1920.  
 Lythgoe, A. M. Discoveries at Lisht. *Anc. Eg.*, 1915, p. 145.  
 Mace, A. C. Excavations at Lisht. *Bull. Metr. Mus. N.Y.*, Oct. 1914.  
 — and H. E. Winlock. Egyptian Expedition, 1920-1. *Bull. Metr. Mus. N.Y.*, Nov. 1921.  
 — — — The Tomb of Senebtisi. New York, 1916.  
 Morgan, J. de, Legrain, and Jéquier. Fouilles de Dahchour. 1895, 1903.  
 Myres, J. L. Herodotus and the Egyptian Labyrinth. *Liv. A.A.*, 1910, p. 134.  
 Naville, E. Bubastis. 1891.  
 — H. R. Hall, and others. The XIth Dynasty Temple, Deir el-bahari. 1907-13.  
 Newberry, P. E., and others. Beni Hasan. 1893.  
 — El Bersheh. 1894.  
 Petrie, W. M. F. Illahun, Kahun, and Gurob. 1890.  
 — Kahun, Gurob, and Hawara. 1890.  
 — Hyksos and Israelite Cities. 1906.  
 — and others. Abydos, I-III. 1902-4.  
 — and G. A. Wainwright. The Labyrinth, Gerzeh, and Mazghuneh. 1912.  
 Randall-Maciver, D., and C. L. Woolley. Buhen. Philadelphia, 1911.  
 • Reisner, G. Excavations at Kerma. *Z. Aeg.*, 1914, pp. 34, 40.  
 — The Tomb of Hepzefa. *J.E.A.*, 1918, p. 36.  
 — Boston Mus. Bull., April, 1914; Dec. 1915. (Reports.)  
 Schäfer, H. Grab- u. Denksteine des mittleren Reichs. *Cairo Mus. Catalogue*, 1902.  
 Steindorff, G. Grabfunden des mittleren Reichs. Berlin, 1896-1901.  
 Winlock, H. E. The Theban Necropolis in the Middle Kingdom. *A.J.S.L.*, Oct. 1915; cf. *Anc. Eg.*, 1916, p. 82.

## (e) LITERARY, RELIGIOUS, AND OTHER MISCELLANEA

- Budge, Sir E. A. W. *Literature of the Ancient Egyptians*. 1914.  
 ——— *Rhind Papyrus*. 1898.  
 Eisenlohr, A. *Ein mathematisches Handbuch der alten Aegypter*. Leipzig, 1877.  
 (Rhind Papyrus.)  
 Erman, A. *Handbook to Egyptian Religion*. (Transl. A. S. Griffith, 1907.)  
 ——— *Gespräch eines Lebensmüden mit seiner Seele*. Berlin, 1896.  
 ——— *Märchen des Papyrus Westcar*. Berlin, 1890.  
 ——— *Mahnworte eines ägyptischen Propheten*. S.B. Berlin, 1919, p. 804.  
 Gardiner, A. H. *Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage*. Leipzig, 1909.  
 ——— *Erzählung des Sinuhe*. Leipzig, 1909.  
 ——— *Notes on the Story of Sinuhe*. 1916.  
 ——— *New Literary Works*. J.E.A., 1914, pp. 20 *seqq.* (See also Vogelsang, F.)  
 Maspero, G. *Contes Populaires*. 1889.  
 Mercer, S. A. *Religious and Moral Ideas in Egypt*. Milwaukee, 1919.  
 Peet, T. E. *A Mortuary Contract of the XIth Dyn.* Liv. A.A., 1916.  
 Petrie, W. M. F. *Funereal Figures*. *Anc. Eg.*, 1916, p. 151.  
 ——— *Egyptian Tales*. (With F. Ll. Griffith.)  
 Schäfer, H. *Die Mysterien des Osiris in Abydos. Untersuchungen*. Leipzig, 1904.  
 Schmidt, V. *Levende og Døde i det gamle Egypten*. Copenhagen, 1919.  
 Spiegelberg, W. *Aeg. Randglossen zum Alten Testament*. Strassburg, 1904.  
 Vogelsang, F. *Kommentar zu den Klagen des Bauern. Untersuchungen*. Leipzig, 1913.  
 ——— and A. H. Gardiner. *Die Klagen des Bauern*. Berlin, 1908.  
 Weigall, A. E. P. *The Treasury of Ancient Egypt*. 1911.

# I. SYNCHRONISTIC TABLE<sup>1</sup>

656

SYNCHRONISTIC TABLE: c. 5000—c. 3000 B.C.

B.C.	Egypt	Babylonia, Assyria	Aegean, Cyprus, etc.
5000		<i>Sumerians in Mesopotamia</i>	
4500		<i>Semitic dynasty at Kish</i> (? p. 365)	
4241 (or 4238)	<i>Calendar introduced in Lower Egypt.</i> <i>First Sothic Cycle begins</i> (pp. 168, 248) <i>Dual kingdom in existence</i>		
4000	<i>Relations between Egypt, Syria and Mesopotamia</i>		<i>Beginning of Bronze Age in Crete, and Early Minoan Period I begins</i> (Early Helladic I begins)
3500	<i>First Dynasty</i> <i>Age of Narmer</i> (? = Menes)	<i>Third dynasty of Kish</i> (computed at c. 3638 B.C.) <i>Contemporary records begin</i>	
3350	<i>Second Dynasty</i> (northern) <i>Semitic type of names</i> (p. 274 sq.)		
3200	<i>Third Dynasty</i> (southern) <i>Zoser builds 'step-pyramid' of Sakkarah</i>	<i>Dynasty of Akshak</i> (earliest approximately fixed date, 3200 B.C., in Sumerian history)	
	<i>Snefru builds pyramids of Dahshur and Medum</i>		<i>Cedars of Lebanon imported by Egypt</i>
3100	<i>Fourth Dynasty</i> <i>Age of three Great Pyramids of Gizeh</i> (Cheops, etc.) <i>Copper and wheel-pottery in use</i>	<i>Ur-nina, first known ruler of Lagash</i> (3100 B.C.) <i>Fourth Dynasty of Kish</i> (3089 B.C.)	<i>Early Minoan II begins</i>
3000	<i>Fifth Dynasty</i> (Heliopolitan usurpers) <i>Prominence of Sun-worship</i>	<i>Eannatum of Lagash overthrows Kish.</i> <i>His Stele of Vultures</i>	

<sup>1</sup> A few dates are added after 1580 B.C. for the sake of reference



SYNCHRONISTIC TABLE: c. 2900—c. 2600 B.C. 657

2900	Pyramid of Abusir	Urukagina of Lagash (social reformer, p. 387) Rise of Lugal-zaggisi (2897 B.C.), who claims to rule from Mediterranean to Persian Gulf	Copper Age in Cyprus begins
2870	Dedkere Isesi (2883–2855 B.C.). (Proverbs of Ptah-hotep— <i>according to a Middle Kingdom papyrus</i> , pp. 288, 348) Intercourse with Somaliland and Phoenicia Unis (2855–2825 B.C.). Pyramid texts of Sakkarah <i>Sixth Dynasty</i> (2825– B.C.) Pepi I (2795–2742 B.C.) Second Sothic Cycle begins	Sargon, Founder of SEMITIC KINGDOM OF ACAD. Conquests in Syria and (?) Asia Minor  Naram-Sin defeats Manium of Magan (= Arabia? p. 415 sq.), 2795 B.C. His Stele of Victory  Shargalisharri subdues Amorites, 2737 B.C. (p. 420) War with Gutium Ur-Bau patesi of Lagash	(Troy: First Settlement, see p. 613.)   Palestine attacked by Pepi I
2781 (or 2778)	Pepi II (2738–2644 B.C.) Increased trade with Nubia Negro pressure northward	Inroad of Gutî on Sumer and Akkad	(Chalcolithic age in Thessaly) (Early Helladic II)
2700	End of OLD KINGDOM First 'Intermediate Period' <i>Seventh to Tenth Dynasties</i> Asiatics invade Egypt (pp. 296, 344)	Gudea of Lagash Intercourse with Magan, Melukhkha, Mount Amanus, etc. Utukhegal overthrows dynasty of Gutium and founds fifth dynasty of Erech (c. 2524–2474, see p. 434)	Early Minuan III begins
2600			

B.C.	Egypt	Babylonia, Assyria	Aegean, Cyprus, etc.
2500		[Ushpia and Kikia (Mitannian?) kings of Assyria] Dynasty of Ur <i>Sumerian Revival</i> , under Ur-Engur (author of Sumerian law code), 2474 B.C., and Dungi (2456 B.C.) Conquest of Elam, Amor, etc.	Cappadocia attached to Empire of Ur (?)
2400	MIDDLE KINGDOM <i>Eleventh Dynasty</i> (Theban), 2375-2212 B.C. (p. 169 sq.)  Bronze Age	Bur-Sin (2398 B.C.) Zariku, king of Assyria, tributary to Sumer Gimil-Sin builds wall of Amor (2387 B.C.) Fall of dynasty of Ur: attacked by Amor and Elam Ishbi-girra, king of Isin (2357 B.C.). Rivalry of Isin and Larsa	(Early Helladic III)
2300	Nebhapetre (2290-2242 B.C.)	Lipit-ishtar of Isin (2274-2264 B.C.), driven out by Amor (p. 476). Brief Sumerian revival Gungunum of Larsa (2264-2238 B.C.)	<i>Middle Minoan I</i> begins
2200	<i>Twelfth Dynasty</i> Amenemhet I (2212-2182 B.C.) Renascent of Art Nubia Egyptianized Prominence of god Amon Senusret I (2192-2147 B.C.)	<i>First Dynasty of BABYLON</i> Sumu-abum (2225 B.C.) Sumu-la-ilum (2211-2176 B.C.) Destruction of Kish Elamite invasion	Bronze Age (First Period) in Cyprus begins

		Conquest of S. Babylonia by the Elamite Kutur-mabuk 'father' of Amor Fall of Larsa (2167 B.C.) Rim-Sin, Elamite ruler of Larsa (2155- 2094 B.C.) Conquers Erech (2134 B.C.) and Isin (2125 B.C.) HAMMURABI (2123-2081 B.C.), retakes Erech and Isin (2117 B.C.); defeats Elam (2094 B.C.) and Rim-Sin; becomes king of Amor; extends his rule over Assyria (2087 B.C.); code (c. 2090 B.C.) Samsu-iluna (2080- B.C.) Decline of Babylonia	Building of Palace of Cnossus begins  <i>Middle Minoan II</i> begins (Middle Helladic) (Bronze Age in Thessaly)  Presumed age of Abraham (pp. 163-17, 225)
2100	Senusret II (2118-2099 B.C.) Beni-Hasan tombs (p. 228) Senusret III (2099-2061 B.C.) War in Palestine		
	Amenemhet III (2061-2013 B.C.)	Ilumailu (2070- B.C.)  Ilumailu takes Nippur (c. 2052 B.C.) Amor attacks Babylonia (2045 B.C.) Revolt of Akkad (2044 B.C.)	(Troy: Second City destroyed, see p. 614)
2000	<i>Twelfth Dynasty</i> ends Second 'Intermediate Period,' including <i>Thirteenth to Seventeenth Dynasties</i>	Samsu-ditana (1956-1926 B.C.)  Hittite raid on Akkad (1926 B.C.) End of <i>First Dynasty of Babylon</i>	Destruction of Palaces of Cnossus and Phaestus <i>Middle Minoan III</i> begins Cessation of direct intercourse of Crete with Egypt
1900	Hyksos invasion		
1800	Introduction of the horse into Egypt	Kassites under Gandash conquer Baby- lonia (1746 B.C.)	

SYNCHRONISTIC TABLE: c. 2200—c. 1800 B.C. 659\*

B.C.	Egypt	Babylonia, Assyria	Aegean, Cyprus, etc.
1700		Beginning of KASSITE <i>Dynasty</i> (1746 B.C.)	
1600	War of liberation, led by Thebes, against the Hyksos The Hyksos expelled The NEW KINGDOM begins with the <i>Eighteenth Dynasty</i> Accession of Ahmose I (1580 B.C.)	End of the Sea-Country kings (1703 B.C.) Assyria overlord of the Semites of the Middle Euphrates (p. 468)	
1500	Thutmose III (1501-1447 B.C.) Wars in Syria	Agum II (Kassite), 1561-1537 B.C.	<i>Late Minoan I</i> begins (Late Helladic or Mycenaean I)
1400	Age of the Amarna Letters and Boghaz Keui tablets		Bronze Age (Second Period) in Cyprus <i>Late Minoan II</i> (Late Helladic II) Destruction of Palaces of Chossus and Phaestus <i>Late Minoan III</i> begins (Late Helladic III)
1300	<i>Nineteenth Dynasty</i> (c. 1350 B.C.) Beginning of Third Sothic Cycle (1321 B.C.)		
1200	<i>Twentieth Dynasty</i>	Shalmaneser I (1276-1257 B.C.)	Sixth City of Troy

# LIST OF EGYPTIAN KINGS

## II

### SELECT LIST OF EGYPTIAN KINGS OF THE OLD AND MIDDLE KINGDOMS, c. 3500—1580 B.C.<sup>1</sup>

Predynastic Kings of Lower Egypt	Predynastic Kings of Upper Egypt
..... Tiu Thesh Hsekiu Uaznar .....	.....  Ro .....

#### FIRST DYNASTY: c. 3500—3350 (?) B.C.

Historical	Traditional	Manetho
'Scorpion' Narmerza } Aha Men }	Meni	Mēnēs
Zer (? Khent) Atoti	{ Teti Atoti	Athōthis Ouenephēs
Za	Ata	Kenkenēs
Den (? Udimu) Semti	Hsapti	Ousaphais
Enezib Merpeba	Merbap	Miebis
Semerkhet Nekht	Shemsu	Semempsēs
Ka Sen	Kebh	Biēnekhēs

#### SECOND DYNASTY: c. 3350—3190 (?) B.C.

Historical	Traditional	Manetho
Hotepsekhemui	Buzau	Boēthos
Reneb	Kakau	Kaiekhōs
Neneter	Banentiru	Binōthris
Sekhemib Perenmaat } Peribsen }	Uaznas	[O]tlas
Senedi	Senedi	Sethenēs Khairēs
	Neferkere	Nepherkherēs
	Neferkesokari	Sesōkhris
	Huzefa	Khenerēs

<sup>1</sup> All the dates in this list must be regarded as provisional, and as followed by a query; see above, pp. 166–73, and Chaps. VII sq. It should be observed that they differ slightly from those of Breasted and the German School in the earlier dates assigned to the XIth–XIIIth Dynasties, and consequently to all that precede (pp. 169, 315). For fuller details see H. R. Hall, *The Ancient History of the Near East*, pp. 17 sqq., 120, 126, 134 sq., 148.

## LIST OF EGYPTIAN KINGS

THIRD DYNASTY: *c.* 3190–3100 (?) B.C.

Historical		Traditional	Manetho
Khasekhem [Khasekhemui]	} Besh	Zazai [Bebi]	Necherōphes
Zoser		Zoser	Tosorthros
Sanekht		Nebka	{ Tyreis Mesōchris Sōyphis
		Zoserteti	Tosertasis
		Sezes	Achēs
Neferka		Neferkere	Kerpheres ( <i>i.e.</i> Nephherkeres)
Snefru		Snefru	S[n]ēphouris

FOURTH DYNASTY: *c.* 3100–2965 (?) B.C.

Historical		Manetho	Herodotus and Diodorus
Sharu (?)	3100–3098	Sōris	
Khufu	3098–3075	Souphis	Cheops
Rededef	3075–3067	Ratoises	
Khafre	3067–3011	Souphis	Chephrēn, Chabryes
Menkaure	3011–2988	Mencherēs (Bicheris)	Mykerinos
Shepseskaf	2988–2970	Sebercherēs	
—	2970–2965	Thamphthis	

FIFTH DYNASTY: *c.* 2965–2825 (?) B.C.

Historical		Manetho
Userkaf	2965–2958	Ousercherēs
Sahure	2958–2946	Sephrēs
Neferirikere Kakau	2946–2936	Nephhercherēs
Neferefre Shepseskere	2936–2929	Sisirēs
Khaneferre	2929–2925	Cherēs
Neuserre An	2925–2891	Rathourēs
Menkauhor	2891–2883	Mencherēs
Dedkere Isesi	2883–2855	Tancherēs
Unis	2855–2825	Onnos

SIXTH DYNASTY: *c.* 2825–2631 (?) B.C.

Teti	}	2825–2795	Othoēs
Userkere Ati			
Merire Pepi I		2795–2742	Phios
Merenre Mehtimsaf I		2742–2738	Methesouphis
Neferkere Pepi II		2738–2644	Phiōps
Merenre Mehtimsaf II		2644–2643	Menthessouphis
Neterkere	}	2643–2631	Nitōkris
Menkere			

## SEVENTH AND EIGHTH DYNASTIES (Traditional and Manethonian)

# 1 IST: DYNASTIES III—XIV

663

## NINTH AND TENTH DYNASTIES (Herakleopolite): *c.* 2500–2300 (?) B.C. (Chief Kings)

Historical	Manetho
Meriebre Ekhtai I (Khati)	Akhthoēs
Uohkere Ekhtai II	
Uazkere	
Merikere	

## ELEVENTH DYNASTY (Theban): *c.* 2375–2212 (?) B.C.

Iniotef-‘o (Intef-‘o) I (Hor Uah-ankh)	2375	
Iniotef (Intef) II (Hor Nakhtnebtetpnefer)		
Mentuhotep I (Hor Sankhibtoui)		
Nebtoui		
Mentuhotep II		
Nebkhrure		
Nebhapetre		
Mentuhotep III (Hor Neterhezet)	2290–2242	
Mentuhotep III (Hor Samtoui)		
Sankhkere Mentuhotep IV	2242–2212	

## TWELFTH DYNASTY (Theban): *c.* 2212–2000 (?) B.C.

Monuments, etc.		Manetho
Sehetepibre Amenemhet I	2212–2182	Ammenemēs
(Co-reg.)		
Kheperkere Senusret I	2192–2147	Sesonkhōsis
(Co-reg.)		
Nubkaure Amenemhet II	2150–2115	Ammenemēs
(Co-reg.)		
Khakheperre Senusret II	2115–2099	Sesōstris
Khakaure Senusret III	2099–2061	Lakharēs
Nemaatre Amenemhet III	2061–2013	Ammerēs (Lamaris)
(Iuibre Hor; co-reg.?)		
Maatkhrure Amenemhet IV	2013–2004	Ammenemēs
Sebeknefrure	2004–2000	Skemiophris

## THIRTEENTH AND FOURTEENTH DYNASTIES (Chief Kings)

Khutouire Ugafa (Northern) <i>c.</i> 2000 (?)	
Sekhemkere Amenemhetsenbef	
Sankhibtoui Amenemhet-Intef-Amenemhet	
Sneferibre Senusret IV (Theban)	
Sekhemrekhutai Sebekhotep I	
Sekhemuazkaure Sebekemsaf I	
Sekhemresesheditai Sebekemsaf II	
Sekhemneferkhaure Upuautemsaf	
Smenkhkhere Mermeshau (Northern)	
Menuazre	
Sekhemresuaztai Sebekhotep II	
Mersekhemre Neferhotep	
Khaneferre Sebekhotep III	
Merneferre Ai I	
Khahetepre Sebekhotep IV	
Khaankhre Sebekhotep V	
Sekhemreherhimaat Intef-‘o III	
Sekhemreupmaat Intef-‘o IV	
Nubkheperre Intef V, <i>c.</i> 1750 (?)	
Nemaatenkhare Khenzer	
Nehesi	

•664• EGYPTIAN KINGS, DYNASTIES XV—XVII

FIFTEENTH AND SIXTEENTH DYNASTIES (Hyksos): c. 1800 (?)–1580 B.C.

Monuments		Manetho
Semken		
'Ant-hal		
Sekhanre? = Yekebbaal		
Meruserre Yekebhal		Salitis
Maa-ab-re Pepi		Bnōn
'Opehtire Nubti (?), c. 1700	} Probable identifications	{ Apakhnas Apophis Jannas (Staan, Siaan) Assis (Aseth)
Nebkhepeshre Apopi I		
Seuserenre Khian		
Nekare II? = Uazed		
'O-user-Re Apopi II		
'O-seh-Re		
'Okenenre Apopi III		

SEVENTEENTH DYNASTY (Theban): c. 1635–1580 B.C.

Sekenenre I Tau-'o	1635–1615
Sekenenre II Tau-'o-'o	1615–1605
Sekenenre III Tau-'o-ken	1605–1591
Uazkheperre Kamose	1591–1581
Senekhtenre	1581–1580



# III

## LIST OF KINGS AND PATESIS OF SUMER AND AKKAD<sup>1</sup>

Dynasty	Date approximate B.C.	Years (according to the lists)	Contemporary patesis of	
			Lagash	Kish, etc.
(1) First dynasty of Kish <sup>2</sup> (about 5 names missing)	c. 5500 (?)			
...-bu-um				
...tab-ba		780+		
Galumum		900		
Zukakipu (Scorpion)		840		
Arpu		720		
Etana		635		
Balikh, Walikh, son		410		
Enmenunna, son		611		
Melam-Kish, son		900		
Barsalnunna, son		1200		
Meszagud, son				
..., son				
.....				
About 5 names missing				
Total about 21 kings				

RULERS OF SUMER AND AKKAD

<sup>1</sup> See Langdon, 'The Early Chronology of Sumer and Egypt,' *J.E.A.*, vii (1921), pp. 133-53.

<sup>2</sup> The 1st Dynasty of Kish and the 1st Dynasty of Erech are based upon Poebel, *Historical and Grammatical Texts*, No. 2, Obv., Cols. i, ii and No. 3, Cols. i, ii. The list on No. 2 was continued into Col. iii, but is broken away at the point where the 1st Dynasty of Ur begins. The names of the 1st Dynasty of Kish are partially preserved on Poebel, No. 5, Obv. i.

Dynasty	Date approximate B.C.	Years (according to the lists)	Contemporary patesis of	
			Lagash	Kish, etc.
(2) First dynasty of Erech (Sumerian)	c. 5000 (?)			
Meskingasher		325		
Emmerkar, son		420		
Lugalbanda		1200		
Tammuz		100		
Gilgamesh		126		
-lugal, son				
About 2 names missing				
Total about 8 kings				
(3) First dynasty of Ur <sup>1</sup> (Sumerian)	c. 4216			
Mesannipadda		80		
Meskenagnunna		30		
Elulu		25		
Balulu		36		
Total 4 kings		Total 171		
(4) Dynasty of Awan <sup>2</sup> (Sumerian) (?)	c. 4045			
.....				
.....				
.....				
Total 3 kings		Total 356 (?)		

<sup>1</sup> The 1st Dynasty of Ur is based upon Poebel, *ibid.*, No. 2, Obv. III, and the Legrain tablet, Obv. I (*Museum Journal*, Philadelphia, 1920, XI, 175-80; see *J.E.A.*, VII, 142, n. 5).

<sup>2</sup> The names of the Awan dynasty have been given by Poebel, No. 2, Obv. III, 19-199, but only the name *A-wa-an* remains. The number of names in this dynasty is obtained from the summary on Poebel, No. 2, Rev. XI, 16-20. The number 356 given in the summary is reduced to 100 in the above scheme.

(5) Second dynasty of Ur <sup>1</sup> (Sumerian)	c. 3945		
.....			
.....			
.....			
Total 4 (?)		Total 108 (?)	
(6) Second dynasty of Kish <sup>2</sup> (Semitic)	c. 3837		
.....			
.....			
.....			
Total 5 kings (?)		Total 3792 (sic) read 192 (?)	
(7) Dynasty of Khamazi <sup>3</sup> (Sumerian)	c. 3645		
...ni-ish		7	
Total 1		Total 7	Utug... (patesi of Kish)
(8) Third dynasty of Kish <sup>4</sup> (Semitic)	c. 3638		Ninkisalsi (Adab)
Mesilim			Lugalshagengur
Urzaged			
Lugal-tarsi			
Lugal... aga			
.....			
Enbi-Ashdar			Ur-Enlil (Nippur)
Total 6		Total 150 (?)	

RULERS: c. 5000 (?)—c. 3488 B.C.

<sup>1</sup> The length of this dynasty is ascertained from the summary in Poebel, No. 2, Rev. XI, 11-15, where the total of the three Ur dynasties is given as 396 years. The Ist and IIIrd Ur Dynasties are given as 171 + 117 years, leaving 108 for the IIrd Dynasty. The total number of kings appears to be either 13 or 14, and the number in the Ist and IIIrd Dynasties is 4 + 5, leaving 4 or 5 names for the IIrd Dynasty.

<sup>2</sup> The only information concerning this dynasty is preserved on the Lagrain tablet, Obv. II, where the total number of kings is either 5 or 6, more likely 6 in the photograph. The length of the dynasty is there given as 3792. (The number 3600 is written in Sumerian with a single sign.)

<sup>3</sup> Based upon the Lagrain tablet, Obv. II, and Poebel, No. 2, Rev. Col. XI end.

<sup>4</sup> The dynastic lists contain no information concerning the IIIrd Dynasty of Kish, and the IIrd Dynasty of Erech. The number of kings in each is approximately determined by subtracting the known dynasties from the summaries at the end of Poebel, No. 2. The names are supplied from the inscriptions, and the order is based upon later references to Enbi-Ashdar and Enshagkushanna.

Dynasty	Date approximate B.C.	Years (according to the lists)	Contemporary patesis of	
			Lagash	Umma
(9) Second dynasty of Erech (Sumerian) Enshagkushanna Lugal-kigub-nidudu Lugal-kisalsi ..... Total 4	c. 3488	Total 130 (?)		
(10) Dynasty of Adab <sup>1</sup> Lugal-annimundu (Lugal-dalu) (Mebasi) Total 3	c. 3358	90  Total 90		
(11) Dynasty of Maer <sup>1</sup> (Sumerian) An-Bu ...gi, son ..... ...-Babbar Total 4 kings	c. 3268	30   80		
(12) Akshak (Opis) <sup>2</sup> (Semitic) Unzi	c. 3188	30	Shuruppak magistrates: Enkhegal (king at Lagash)	
Undalulu		12		
Urur		6		Patesis of Umma
Gimil-Shakhan		20		Eabzu
Ishu-el		24	Ur-Nina (king), c. 3100	
Gimil-Sin		7		
Total 6 kings		Total 99		

<sup>1</sup> Based upon the Legrain tablet, Obv. III.

<sup>2</sup> Here begins the Scheil dynastic tablet whose obverse contains a complete list of the kings of Akshak, the IVth Dynasty of Kish, and the IIIrd Dynasty of Erech. The summary at the end of the Akshak dynasty is preserved on the Legrain tablet, Obv. IV.

(13) Fourth dynasty of Kish <sup>1</sup> (Semitic)	c. 3089		Akurgal, c. 3050, son	Ush
			Eannatum, son	Enakallī
			Enannatum I, brother	Urlumma
				Ilī
Azag-Bau (queen and queen-regent for — (?) years)		26 (?)	Entemena, son	
Gimil-Sin, son		25		
Ur-Ilbaba, son		80	Enannatum II, son	Ukush
Zimudar		30	Enetarzi	
Uziwadar, son		6	Enlitarzi, 5 years	
Elmuti		11	Lugalanda, 9, son	
Imu-Shamash		11	Urukagina (king), 6	Lugal-zaggisi, son
Nanija		3		
Total 8 kings		Total 192 (?)		
(14) Third dynasty of Erech (Sumerian)	c. 2897			
Lugal-zaggisi		25		
(15) Dynasty of Agade <sup>2</sup> (Semitic)	c. 2872			
Sargon		55	Engilsa	
Rimush, son		15	Ur-E	Surushkin
Manishtusu, son		7	Lugal-ushungal	Lu-Shara
Narām-Sin		56	Ugme	
Sharkalishari, son		25	Urmama	
'Who was king, who was not king?'				
Igigi				
Imi		3	Gimil-mama	
Nani				
Elulu				
Dudu		21	Ka-azag	
Gimil-Dur-Ul		15	Ur-Bau, c. 2700	
Total 12 kings		Total 197		

RULERS: c. 2800—c. 2675 B.C.

<sup>1</sup> This list is partially preserved on the Legrain tablet, Obv. iv.

<sup>2</sup> The Agade dynasty is completely preserved on the Legrain tablet, Rev. i, as now restored; the Scheil tablet, Obv. 23—Rev. 9; and Poebel, No. 3, Rev. viii.

Dynasty	Date approximate B.C.	Years (according to the lists)	Contemporary patesis of	
			Lagash	Umma
(16) Fourth dynasty of Erech <sup>1</sup> (Sumerian)	c. 2675			
Urigin		3	Ugar	
Urgir, son		6	Nammakhni	
Kudda		6	Ur-Ninsun	
Migir-ili		5		
Ur-Babbar		6	Ur-Babbar (?)	
Total 5 kings		Total 26		
(17) Dynasty of Gutium <sup>2</sup> (Hittite ?)	c. 2649			
Imbia		5		
Ingishu		7		
Warlagaba		6		
Larlagash		3 (?)		
.....				
.....				
...da				
...ti				
...an-gab				
Si-um				Lugalannatum
(a) Lasirab				
(b) Erridupizir			Gudea (2600)	
(c) Arlagan				Nammakhni
(d) Saratigubisin (?)			Ur-Ningirsu	Galu-Babbar
.....				
Tinkān				
Total 21 kings		Total 125		

<sup>1</sup> Based upon the Scheil tablet, Rev. 10-16, and Poebel, No. 4, Obv. 1.

<sup>2</sup> This list is partially restored by the Legrain tablet, Rev. 11, and Poebel, No. 4.

(18) Fifth dynasty of Erech (Sumerian)	c. 2524		
Utukhegal			
(Space on Legrain tablet for about two names)			
Total 3 kings		Total 50 (?)	
		(see pp. 434,	
		441 sq.)	
(19) Third dynasty of Ur <sup>1</sup> (Sumerian)	c. 2474		
Ur-Engur		18	Urabba
Dungi, son		58	
			{ Lukazal
Bur-Sin, son		9	{ Ur-lama
			{ Alla
			{ Ur-lama (reappointed)
Gimil-Sin, son		8	
Ibi-Sin, son		25	
Total 5 kings		Total 117	(2357)

<sup>1</sup> Based upon Poebel, No. 4, Rev. 1-5.

RULERS: c. 2675—c. 2357 B.C.

## IV

KINGS OF ISIN, LARSA, BABYLON, ETC.<sup>1</sup>

Isin	Larsa	Babylonia	Assyria	Elam	Kish, etc.
Ishbi-Girra (2357)	Naplanu(m) (2357)		c. 2500 Ushpia, Kikia c. 2400 Zariku	Kutur-nakhhunte (? c. 2357) Lila-irtash, pre- sumed son	
Gimil-ilishu, son (2325)	Emišu(m) (2336)				
Idin-Dagan, son (2315)					
Ishme-Dagan, son (2294)	Samu(m) (2308)				
Lipit-Ishtar, son or brother (2274)					
	Zabaia (2273)		Enlil-kapkapu		
	Gungunu(m) (2264)				
Ur-Ninurta (2263)			Puzur-Ashir I		KISH. Ashduni-erim
	Abi-sari (2237)		Shalim-akhu(m), son		(c. 2250)

ISIN, LARSA, BABYLON, ETC.

<sup>1</sup> The dates are approximate merely. They depend primarily upon the approximate dates of Shalmaneser and other Assyrian kings of the thirteenth and twelfth centuries, upon their references to earlier kings, and upon references to kings as contemporaneous. In other cases, and where no dates are suggested, the position of kings (e.g. of Assyria) is conjectural. See further above, pp. 152-6, and Chaps. XIII and XV. Ungler's date for the first year of Ammi-zaduga (viz. 1977)—based on Babylonian observations of Venus—is here accepted; but Weidner *M.D.O.G.* 1915 and 1921 makes it 1809, and this discrepancy affects all the early dates.



C.A.H. I	Bur-Sin, son (2235)	Sumu-ilu(m) (2226)	FIRST BABYLONIAN DYNASTY (2225-).		
		Sumu-abu(m) (2225)	Ilu-shuma	Silkhakha (Simiti- Shilkhal)	
	Iter-pī-sha, son (2214)	Sumu-la-ilu(m) (2211)	Irishu(m) I, son		
	Girra-imiti, brother (2209)		Ikunu(m), son		Manana (c. 2212)
	Enlil... (2202) Enlil-bani (2201)		Sharru-kin I, son (c. 2200)		Sumu-ditana Yapium (c. 2206) ? Khalium
		Nur-Adad (2197)			KAZALLU. Yakhzir-ilu (2194- 2187)
		Sin-idinna(m), son (2181)	Puzur-Ashir II		
	Zambia (2177) ? ..... (2174) ? Ur-azag (2169)	Sin-iribu(m) (2175) Sin-ikisha(m) (2173) Silli-Adad (2168) Warad-Sin (2167), son of Kutur- Mabuk	Zab(?)u(m), son (2175)		
	Sin-magir (2165)		Akhi-Ashir	Kutur-Mabuk (c. 2167)	ERECH. Siniriba(m) (con- temp. Warad-Sin)
		Abil-Sin, son (2161)			
43		Rim-Sin I, brother (2155)	Rim-Sin (of Larsa)		

KINGS: c. 2357—c. 2155 B.C.

Isin	Larsa	Babylonia	Assyria	Elam	Ereh
Damik-ilishu, son (2154-2125)		Sin-muballit, son (2143)	Irishu(m) II		Warad-nene (con- temp. Rim-Sin)
		Hammurabi, son (2123)	Shamshi-Adad I (living c. 2113?) Ishme-Dagan I, son		
		Samsu-iluna, son (2080)			
FIRST DYNASTY OF THE SEA-COUNTRY (c. 2070-1703). Iluma-ilu (c. 2070)	Rim-Sin II (2071) (p. 556)				
	? Iluma-ilu		...-ashshat		
		Abeshu', son (2042) Ammi-ditana, son (2014)			
Itti-ili-nibi (2010)		Ammi-zaduga, son (1977)	Rimush	Sadi or Taki	
<sup>3</sup> Damki-ilishu (1955)		Samsu-ditana, son (1956-1926)			Anam Sin-gashid Sin-gamil

Ishkibal (1919)		Adasi	(?) Arad-shagshag
Shushshi (1904)		Enlil-bani, son	
Gulkishar (1877) <sup>1</sup>		Shabai	
Peshgal-daramash, son of Gulkishar (1822)		Shar-ma-Adad I	
A-dara-kalama, son (1772)		Gizil-Sin	
		Zimzai	
		Lulla	
	KASSITE DYNASTY (c. 1746-1169). Gandash (1746)		
Akur (Ekur)-ul-ana (1744)		Shi-Ninua	
	Agum I, son (1730)	Shar-ma-Adad II	
Melam-kurkura (1718)		Irishum III	
		Shamshi-Adad II (1716)	
Ea-gamil (1711- 1703)			
	Kashtiliash I (1708)		
	Ushshi (1686)	Ishme-Dagan II, son (1686)	
	Abirattash (1678?)	Shamshi-Adad III, son (1661)	
	Kashtiliash II	.....(1636)	
	Tazzi-gurumash (1636)		
	Kharba-Shipak (1611)	Puzur-Ashir III (1611)	
	.....(1586)	Enlil-nasir (1586)	
	Agum II (1561- 1537)	Nur-ili (1561- 1537)	

<sup>1</sup> According to new Ashur texts another king ...ri-en is to be inserted here.